GENERAL LIBRARY
UNIV. OF MICH.
JUL 18 1906

Advocate of Peace.

VOL. LXVIII. BOSTON, JULY, 1906. No. 7

THE AMERICAN PEACE SOCIETY,
PUBLISHERS,
31 BEACON STREET, BOSTON, MASS.

MONTHLY, ONE DOLLAR PER YEAR. TEN CENTS PER COPY

Entered at the Boston Post Office as Second Class Matter.

CONTENTS.

PAGE

EDITORIALS 141-144
The Contagion of Militarism—The Case of Chile and Argentina—The Twelfth Mohonk Arbitration Conference—Platform of the Twelfth Annual Lake Mohonk Conference on International Arbitration.
EDITORIAL NOTES 144-145
The Congress of Nations—Gentlemen, not Shooters.
BREVITIES 145-146
GENERAL ARTICLES:
Letters to the Editor 146-147
The British Friends and the Prime Minister 147
Mr. Carnegie on Reduction of Armaments 147-148
Armaments and the "Next War." *By Hon. John W. Foster* ... 148-150
A Common International Consciousness and a Common International Life. *By Rev. Lyman Abbott, D. D.* 150-152
The Triumphs of Peace. *By Cardinal Gibbons* 152-153
The United States Should Take the Lead in Limitation of Armaments. *By Justice David J. Brewer* 153-154
Work Among College Men and Women. *By Dr. W. H. P. Faunce* 155-156
Constitutional Safeguards Against War. *By Dr. Ernst Richard,* 156-158
What the Last Year Has Won for Us. *By A. B. Farquhar.* 158-159
The Selection of Arbitrators. *By Stephen H. Allen* 159-160
The British National Peace Congress 160-161
PAMPHLETS RECEIVED 161
International Arbitration and Peace Lecture Bureau 161

The Contagion of Militarism — the Case of Chile and Argentina.

One of the worst aspects of militarism is its contagiousness. It spreads like an evil disease. One nation cannot be affected by it without its neighbor becoming infected. If one or two nations desire to escape it they find it, or think they find it, practically impossible to do so without the coöperation of their neighbors. The situation is rendered all the worse when, as is now the case, all the nations are near neighbors to one another.

The militarism of the time is, therefore, practically universal — or rapidly tending to become universal. Even the small nations seem incapable of keeping out of it, though they thereby probably increase the danger of their destruction. Switzerland, though neutralized, and maintaining no standing army, keeps up a system of citizen soldiery and universal military training which costs her even more per capita than is spent by the great powers on their vast standing armies. The Netherlands, Belgium and Denmark, though not much is generally said about their armaments, are quite as active in their preparations for defense as Switzerland. They are always the victims of fear of their big armed neighbors. Our own country, though geographically situated so as to be absolutely impregnable, has yielded to the pressure of European militarism and is now building more war vessels than any other power.

These reflections have been called forth by certain reports coming to us for the last six or eight weeks from South America. According to these reports Chile and Argentina intend, as soon as the five years' treaty between them expires, again to commence increasing their navies. If the reports are correct, this contemplated action is most regrettable. What these two progressive South American nations did in settling their long-standing boundary-dispute by arbitration and in agreeing to make a substantial reduction in their armaments for a period of five years, was an event of the first importance, unique in the history of nations. It has been universally lauded, and cited as an example to be followed by the other nations. It has had extraordinary influence in promoting arbitration and peace sentiment throughout the civilized world. It has advanced the honor of the two nations to an unprecedented height, and also materially promoted their industrial and commercial prosperity.

There is not the least doubt, again, that their security has been as great, or even greater than it was before they reduced their armaments. All the nations have appreciated their action and respected them for it. What they ought, therefore, to do, is to plan to renew their treaties of arbitration and of limitation of armaments when they expire a year and more hence. Their experiment has been altogether successful, and they ought not under any considerations to go back to "the weak and beggarly elements" from which they delivered themselves. The world has a right to expect something better of them. The renewal of their rivalry in armaments will inevitably become an intense and bitter one, the evil effects of which on their welfare can be only vaguely foreseen.

We cannot yet believe that the men at the head of affairs in the two countries, the same men we think that brought to a successful issue the peace negotiations of four years ago, will willingly allow such a disaster to befall their countries. We are well aware of the distrust toward our own country which has sprung up in South American countries, and of an uneasy feeling, especially among Brazilians, towards Germany. But there is no real ground in either case to justify a return to the policy of

increase of armaments. So far as her relations to Bolivia are concerned, Chile, if she has had any fears of trouble from that direction, had better a thousand times give back the territory which she took from her northern neighbor in war, or at any rate fulfill her pledges made at the time about it, than to allow herself to be plunged again into the exhausting expenditures for war preparations which she was making before her agreement with Argentina.

It is sincerely to be hoped that the Pan-American Congress which meets this month at Rio Janeiro will throw its weight solidly against further increase of armaments in South America, indeed in all American countries. There is no reason why all the republics of that continent should not join in a general agreement for permanent limitation of both military and naval expenditures. It would be of untold value to them, and to the world. Brazil, the largest of them, which is, as reported, also to inaugurate a policy of naval expansion, could doubtless be persuaded to join her sister republics in a treaty of limitation. If Chile and Argentina would only make public their intention of renewing their splendid treaties when they expire, and send a cordial invitation to their immediate neighbors — Paraguay, Uruguay, Brazil, Peru and Bolivia — to join them, that whole group of South American countries, at least, might easily be brought into a pacific federation which would add greatly to the influence of what Chile and the Argentine Republic have already done, and stimulate by their example the whole world to follow them.

Perhaps this is too much to expect of them in the present state of the world, in which fear and suspicion and unscrupulous territorial and commercial ambition play still an all too tragic part, and prevent nations desiring to do so from reaching at once the high level for which they are themselves ready. If this be true, and if it be further true that only as the whole family of nations moves together can any one or any group of them make the best and fittest advancement in civilization, it becomes all the more incumbent upon the great world conference which is soon to meet at The Hague to make it impossible for two such nations as Chile and Argentina to be degraded again from the high position which they have heroically attained. Everything singles out the subject of arrest and reduction of armaments as, with only one possible exception, that of a periodic Congress of the Nations, the question of questions with which the second Hague Conference will have to deal.

Count Apponyi, one of the most eminent and influential members of the Interparliamentary Union, has been made Minister of Public Instruction in Hungary. In response to a deputation of the Hungarian Peace Society, the new Minister has promised to recommend to the school authorities the introduction of a Peace Day into the schools of Hungary.

The Twelfth Mohonk Arbitration Conference.

We are publishing in this number of the ADVOCATE OF PEACE some of the more noteworthy of the addresses delivered at the recent Mohonk Conference on International Arbitration. It must not be assumed that because we publish them and heartily approve of their main contentions we agree with every opinion expressed in them. It will be seen from these speeches and from the platform, which we also publish, that the Conference this year was as remarkable for the advanced ground which it took as it was for its numbers and its enthusiasm.

More than three hundred persons were in attendance, among whom was an unusually large number of Congressmen, national and state officials, jurists, diplomats, mayors, and others prominent in public life, not to mention the distinguished clergymen, educators and others from various fields. Out of the one hundred and more business organizations of the great cities of the country which have been brought by the Conference to actively interest themselves in the arbitration movement, fifty responded to Mr. Smiley's invitation and sent special representatives. This was one of the marked features of the Conference, whose *personnel* was on the whole, if possible, more impressive than any that we have ever before seen at Mohonk.

More than half of the States of the Union were represented; namely, Arkansas, Connecticut, Delaware, Florida, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Tennessee, Texas, Vermont, Washington, West Virginia, the District of Columbia and Hawaii. A distinguished professor from the University of Tokyo, Japan, who is studying in this country, was also present. The Conference, therefore, though it continues to be the special personal enterprise of Mr. Smiley, whose wisdom, foresight and devotion — shall we not say, his inspiration? — in creating it become all the more wonderful as the years go by, has become truly national in character and exercises a powerful influence throughout the whole land, and even throughout the world.

Some of the speaking this year was of an unusually high order; in fact, so far as we remember, it has never been surpassed by that at any of the previous Mohonk meetings. Most of it was also practical and constructive, looking to the future and pleading for the taking of the two or three great steps still necessary to bring the nations into a really civilized world-community. There was the usual "reactionary" talk on the part of a few, most of them novices in the Mohonk deliberations, who seemed alarmed lest the Conference should go

too far and too fast in the ways of peace and of renunciation of the militaristic idols of the past. But the positive constructive spirit, so clearly predominant in the Conference, carried the day, and, while acting with moderation and self-restraint, expressed itself in the platform and in resolutions in no uncertain way.

What has impressed us most about the Conference in the last two years is the way in which its program has broadened out to take in other topics than arbitration. This was inevitable. Arbitration is only one phase of a great many-sided world-movement, which is working out with amazing rapidity the unity, coöperation and pacific federation of the nations. Its progress is therefore dependent, in no small degree, upon that of other principles coördinate with it. This the Mohonk Conference has clearly seen.

It is hardly too much to say that arbitration, in any narrow sense of the term, was not the central theme of its deliberations. It of course expressed its great satisfaction at the advancement which arbitration is making, both in public sentiment and in practical institutions. It urged the conclusion of a general treaty of obligatory arbitration at the second Hague Conference. It continued its committees to promote further interest in the subject in the colleges and universities and among business organizations, in both of which spheres most encouraging results have already been attained.

But it went further than this. It declared its approval of the proposal for the neutralization of the great ocean trade routes as urged by the Massachusetts State Board of Trade. It boldly declared in favor of the elaboration of a plan by the second Hague Conference for the establishment of a "permanent and recognized advisory Congress of the Nations." On this matter the two previous conferences had spoken, but with only mild approval. This year for the first time the Conference rose to the full meaning and importance of the subject, and dealt with it in a serious and whole-hearted manner.

The subject of limitation and reduction of armaments, as urged by the British government and House of Commons, received even greater attention. In his opening remarks the Chairman, Mr. Foster, declared that it was of equal importance with the general acceptance of the principle of arbitration that some measure shall be adopted to put a stop to this ever-increasing competition of the great powers in the enlargement of their standing armies and navies. "It is a mockery of sincerity and consistency," Mr. Foster argued, "to solemnly enter into treaty compacts for the settlement of international disputes by peaceful arbitration, while the high contracting parties continue to strain to the utmost their taxing capacity and their credit in preparations for war."

This powerful and timely utterance was reëchoed by other speakers and took deep hold on the Conference. The result was, that in the platform was incorporated a paragraph expressing the earnest hope that the coming Hague Conference might give this subject "careful and favorable consideration," and the adoption of a resolution containing a clause urging the Hague Conference to formulate a plan for the restriction of armaments, and, if possible, for their reduction by concurrent international action."

An effort was made, on motion of Mr. Paine, to induce the Conference to send an earnest remonstrance to Congress against the authorizing of any more battleships, at least until the Hague Conference should have decided whether an international agreement for a general limitation of armaments was practicable. This proposal was warmly supported by more than three-fourths of the membership. But it was so strongly opposed by a small minority, as being a question of detail with which the Conference ought not to occupy itself, that it was decided to be wisest not to attempt to force it through.

Besides the speeches which we publish, very interesting addresses were made by Hon. Richard Bartholdt, on the Introduction of the Peace Movement into Practical Politics, Hon. Charles M. Pepper and Hon. Francis B. Loomis, on the Pan-American Conferences; Dr. Daniel C. Gilman on Work in the Colleges and Universities; Prof. James Brown Scott, Solicitor of the State Department, on the Work of the New American Society of International Law; Hon. William L. Penfield, ex-Solicitor of the State Department; Dean Irwin of Radcliff College, Hon. Samuel J. Barrows, Hon. Samuel B. Capen, Rev. Newell Dwight Hillis, Hon. L. E. Chamberlain, Prof. Honda of Japan, etc., etc.

It would be impossible to give in detail all the excellent things that were said and thought and resolved and planned. One of the chief beneficent results of the Conference is that it stimulates nation-wide thought on the problem of world peace, and sets so many able and intelligent men and women to work actively in various parts of the land to arouse the interest and coöperation of those who have never yet associated themselves with the greatest of all modern reform movements.

We may mention in closing that the Conference manifested its warm appreciation of the "great service in the cause of peace performed by the President of the United States in bringing about the Peace of Portsmouth between Russia and Japan." It also voted unanimously and heartily the following resolution, which as nearly sums up the spirit and intent of the Conference as could well be done in a few words:

"Resolved, that the twelfth annual Mohonk Conference

on International Arbitration respectfully petitions President Roosevelt to instruct the delegates from the United States to the next Hague Conference to urge that body to give favorable consideration to three measures which will greatly conduce to the peace and welfare of the world:

"A plan by which the Hague Conference may become a permanent and recognized Congress of the Nations with advisory powers;

"A general arbitration treaty for the acceptance of all nations;

"A plan for the restriction of armaments, and, if possible, for their reduction by concurrent international action."

Platform of the Twelfth Annual Lake Mohonk Conference on International Arbitration.

The members of this Conference call attention, with great satisfaction, to the steady progress which the world is making in the promotion of international arbitration.

They place on record their appreciation of the character and services of John Hay, the late Secretary of State, and acknowledge that to him lasting gratitude is due for the foresight, firmness and wisdom with which, in his high official station, he upheld the principles which this Conference has advocated.

They have heard with gratification that in many of the leading colleges and universities of this country the undergraduate students have been led to the study of methods by which justice may be secured among nations without resort to war.

This Conference has welcomed to its proceedings the representatives of fifty chambers of commerce, boards of trade, and other commercial organizations, and it urges upon them, and other like institutions not now represented here, to consider and act upon the measures which are from time to time proposed for the promotion of peace.

This Conference regards the approaching assembling of a Pan-American Congress in Rio de Janeiro as likely to promote mutual understanding and consequent goodwill among the states of North, Central and South America.

At the present time it is important that public attention should be concentrated upon the second Hague Conference, soon to be assembled. We hope and believe that the beneficial results of the former conference will be equaled and perhaps surpassed by further deliberations, in the land of Grotius, upon the principles of international law and the best methods for the pacific settlement of international difficulties.

Especially we hope that the second Hague Conference will elaborate and propose a plan by which like conferences may be held at stated periods, and that in the intervals appropriate offices may be maintained at The Hague, so that these conferences may become a permanent and recognized advisory Congress of the Nations.

A general arbitration treaty to be formulated by the Hague Conference is most desirable and will doubtless be accepted by all or nearly all of the countries represented in the Conference.

Among other subjects of immediate importance the many unsettled questions arising out of maritime warfare, including the exemption of private property from seizure at sea, are respectfully commended to the consideration of the Hague Conference.

As the general restriction of armaments can only be secured by concurrent international action, as unanimously recommended by the British House of Commons, we earnestly hope that this subject will receive careful and favorable consideration.

While we shall welcome any action taken by the coming Hague Conference in the way of clearly defining the rights and obligations of belligerents as to each other and as to neutrals, of lessening the horrors of war and of giving increased stability and protection to the Red Cross movement, it is our hope that the Conference will remember that it is consecrated to the great work of ending as well as softening war, and of subjecting the relations of nations to the dominion of law rather than force.

Editorial Notes.

The Congress of Nations.

The idea of a congress of nations for the regular and systematic discussion of questions of common international interest continues to make definite headway. The Interparliamentary Union is shortly to meet in special session to hear the report of its Committee on this subject appointed at Brussels last autumn, and to prepare its program to submit to the second Hague Conference when it meets. At the dinner given on the 29th of May, at the Metropolitan Club, New York, by Mr. Bowen, proprietor of the *Independent*, to the eighteen members of Congress who attended the Brussels Conference as representatives of the United States group, the subject of a periodic international congress or parliament received marked emphasis. Among the speeches, made by Hon. Richard Bartholdt, Hon. Oscar S. Straus, General Grant, Professor Rowe and other distinguished gentlemen, of whom about fifty were present, was one by Prof. John Bassett Moore of Columbia University, ex-Assistant Secretary of State, our greatest American authority on international law. Professor Moore took the most advanced ground on the subject, declaring that the Hague Conference must ultimately develop into a world-parliament, and that the world-government ensuing must embrace the three great

departments of legislative, executive and judicial control. This is the conclusion at which all students of international affairs are arriving as fast as they give themselves time to think the question out in the light of the remarkable world events which are now taking place. The beginning of this world-government will no doubt be very simple on its parliamentary side, as it has been on its judicial side in the Hague Court, but all the rest will follow. Once the Hague Conference is made a periodic body, with delegates from all the nations, with no authority beyond what it now possesses, the world-parliament will take care of itself in due time.

Gentlemen, not Shooters.

E. P. Powell, who usually gets at the very heart of things when he writes, has some very sensible and timely reflections on teaching boys to shoot, in an article entitled a "Vacation at Home" in the *Independent* for June 7. He says:

"I had some pet chipmunks whose home was in a stone wall behind my orchard. This morning I heard shots, and went quickly to prevent mischief; but I was too late. The beautiful creatures had died, to prevent some boys from 'being wrapped up in cotton wool.' They were schoolboys enjoying their Saturday holiday. I thought none too pleasantly of our President's letter to General Wingate, 'I am glad that you have installed in each of the high schools a target rifle practice and are teaching the boys to shoot!' I am quite certain that this rifle practice and the death of my chipmunks will go a very short distance toward defending our country in time of war. Indeed, I am more than suspicious that it will go farther to provoke a war spirit and preserve the brute force element in human nature. At any rate my pets are dead, and I myself — warlike. It was a brute force age that discovered its need of gentlemen; and it is more gentlemen that we still need. There is no mistake in that word. It defined the Raleighs and the Harry Vanes,— men capable of stout deeds, inspired by loving-kindness. It was this sort of spirit that begat sympathy for the under dog. It did not find pleasure in kicking him. It brought in the new age that has extended the Golden Rule to the slave and the Chinaman. The opposite spirit must not regain control in business, politics or pleasure.

"Instead of fitting your boy with gun and rod for his vacation, let me suggest a safer plan — safer morally and safer manfully. Give him a tutor as companion who is in love with nature, and set them loose on a botanical and entomological tramp. My word for it, they will get more pleasure and something besides — that is, strength of character. They will come back to you with companionship and warm hearts. The vacation will not have ended in mere sport. It will not have rubbed off the fine blush of native sweetness and sympathy that belongs to every decently born boy."

If any of our readers have copies of the ADVOCATE OF PEACE for May, 1902, which they do not care to keep, we shall be much obliged if they will kindly send them to our office.

Brevities.

The Senate has added an amendment to the naval bill to the effect that no contracts shall be made for the big battleship provided for in the House Bill until plans and specifications have been completed and presented to Congress. If this amendment is concurred in by the House, it will be most important, as something may happen before the contracts are let to change the position of Congress on the subject. We shall continue to hope that good sense will assert itself, and that this big "short-lived monster" will never be constructed.

. . . We regret to have to record the death of Judge Lynde Harrison of New Haven, Conn., who was stricken with apoplexy on the 8th of June and died during the day. He had just returned from the Mohonk Arbitration Conference, where he had ably and actively represented, as he had done the year before, the Chamber of Commerce of New Haven, and had made an address at the business men's meeting. For the last two years and more Mr. Harrison had been very active in promoting the cause of arbitration and peace, and most influential in arousing interest in the subject at New Haven both in business and intellectual circles. He was one of the foremost citizens of Connecticut, and both as a jurist and statesman had left his impress upon the laws and the constitution of the State.

. . . The Turkish troops, by order of the Sultan, have evacuated Tabah, and thus the tension between that government and Great Britain has been relieved. Great Britain insists on the delimitation of the boundary by an Anglo-Turkish commission instead of by the Turkish and Egyptian officials, as proposed by the Porte.

. . . One of the subjects proposed for the coming year by the Old South Work for prizes to be competed for by the 1905 and 1906 graduates of the Boston High schools is: "The political principles of William Penn, as shown in his writings and in the frame of government of Pennsylvania."

. . . Speaking of international debt-collecting, the *Outlook* says that it would make for the peace of the world if the coming Hague Conference would enunciate these two principles: "1. That any citizen doing business in any civilized country must depend on the courts of that country for the protection of his business interests. 2. That any nation having a financial claim, either on its own account or as a representative of its citizens, against any other nation, must present the claim before the Hague Tribunal; it must not constitute itself judge, jury and sheriff, and proceed itself to collect the debt by force of arms."

. . . The Toronto *Globe*, speaking of the Hague Court, its decisions, the Palace of Peace, etc., says: "While such things are important indications of a growing willingness to arbitrate disputes, it is in the growing spirit of brotherhood among nations that the real results of such movements can be seen."

. . . At the third British National Peace Congress held at Birmingham, June 12-14, it was decided to make an organized effort to bring the peace question before the students of the universities.

. . . At a dinner given at the Hotel Cecil, on June 29, by the Society of American Women in London, in honor of Ambassador and Mrs. Reid and Mr. and Mrs. Longworth, Lord Curzon, in a brilliant speech, said "he declined to recognize Whitelaw Reid as a foreign ambassador, but considered him essentially a domestic one," than whom no American at the Court of St. James had ever held a dearer place. In a tribute to President Roosevelt, he said that the President stood "for the continued and unbreakable friendship of the United States and Great Britain, which has ceased to be an aspiration and has now become a tradition." That is very fine talk, and we hope the reality may always be even finer.

. . . The fourteenth Conference of the Interparliamentary Union will be held in London in the Royal Gallery adjoining the House of Lords, July 23-25. Twenty-five parliamentary groups have been invited to send delegates. It is estimated that the attendance will be double that of any previous conference. The Conveners of the Conference, Wm. Randal Cremer and his associates in the British Parliament, are receiving the sympathy and support of the Prime Minister and the Government generally. The *Arbitrator* announces that the arrest of armaments will be the most important question considered by the Conference. The project to make the Hague Conference a permanent institution, and that for a general treaty of obligatory arbitration, will also hold a prominent place.

. . . Peace prizes in the schools and colleges are becoming very common. At the recent closing exercises many such prizes were bestowed in different parts of the country, given by individuals, by boards of trade, or other organizations. The late Delano Patrick of Hopedale, Mass., a life member of the American Peace Society, provided in his will for three annual peace prizes, $20, $10, and $5, to the pupils of the schools of Milford, Hopedale, Mendon and Bellingham, for the best essays on the subject of peace. These prizes he had already been giving, though his name had been withheld until after his death. At the graduating exercises at Milford on June 21 Superintendent Haley announced his name at the same time that the prizes were announced. The winner of the first prize was a Milford boy, John E. Doherty. When the superintendent handed him a bright $20 gold piece "a storm of enthusiastic plaudits" greeted him. The other prizes went to Miss Gertrude Rockwell and Warren Henry of Hopedale. Twelve essays were presented for the prizes. Mr. Patrick ought to have many followers.

. . . On the 14th of June the Norwegian Storthing chose three members of the Nobel Peace Prize Committee to serve for 1907-09. The persons chosen were Mr. Hagerup, professor of law in the University of Christiania, former president of the Council of Ministers; Mr. Loeveland, Minister of Foreign Affairs; and Mr. Berner, president of the Storthing. Bjoernstjoerne Bjoernson retires from the Committee. The two members whose time has not expired are Mr. Horst and Mr. John Lund. These five distinguished Norwegian statesmen, with the Nobel Foundation under their charge, constitute one of the foremost peace agencies in the world.

. . . The Conference called by the Swiss government for the revision of the Red Cross Convention of 1864 met at Geneva on June 11. Thirty-seven nations were officially represented. The purpose of the Congress is to suggest to the coming Hague Conference such changes in the rules of the Red Cross as will adapt it to modern warfare, and facilitate its extension to maritime warfare.

. . . All those who are interested in the teaching of peace in our schools and colleges — and there are legions of them — will find a very able and interesting article on the subject by Edwin D. Mead in the *Outlook* for June 16.

Letters to the Editor.

Editor of the ADVOCATE OF PEACE:

At the twenty-ninth annual Commencement Exercises of the University of Colorado, held at Boulder on the 16th of June, General Nelson A. Miles delivered the commencement oration. His subject was "Our Country and the Responsibilities and Possibilities of Our Citizens." Amongst other things he said:

"Devotion to country does not alone require heroic acts upon the red fields of war. The patriotism of Benjamin Franklin, Patrick Henry, Thomas Jefferson, Roger Sherman, Gouverneur Morris, Alexander Hamilton and their compatriots was as grand and glorious as that of the martial heroes of that day.

"I cannot better define patriotism than by bringing the illustration home to every citizen. You have the opportunity of benefiting your country by your individual acts or of marring its prosperity by indifference or disregard to its true interests. There is a sacred duty devolving upon every citizen. You can have just as good or just as bad a government as you please, either municipal, state or national, and our only hope rests in the people's devotion to the principles of our institutions. May your patriotism be of the highest order, and its influence felt in every community and in every department of government for the welfare and happiness and progress of our people and the honor and glory of our country.

"I trust that during your lives the spirit of peace may prevail. We have had enough of war, carnage, devastation and desolation. Those who know the least of the hardship and horror of war are its most zealous advocates. It is also a fact that nearly all wars are the result of the selfish ambition of some usurper or cruel tyrant, the intrigue of unscrupulous men or the avarice of a people. Yet wars devastate a country, bankrupt a nation and fill hundreds of thousands of graves with the flower of the nation's manhood, bringing mourning and desolation to happy homes.

"I sincerely hope that within your time the intelligence and wisdom of the people of the world will have so far advanced that there will be established a congress of nations, a grand parliament of reason and justice, that shall consider and decide national and international controversies for the benefit, welfare and peace of nations and the world."

When the students of our State Universities can hear such sentiments as the above from those who speak from knowledge and authority, we can be full of hope for our

great scheme of pushing the work of educating in peace principles the boys and girls in our public schools.

RUTH H. SPRAY.

SALIDA, COLORADO.

Editor of the ADVOCATE OF PEACE:

In an article which you published two or three months ago, I expressed my regret that it was almost impossible to find a school history which did not glorify war and subordinate all the events which it recorded to military occurrences. A reader of the ADVOCATE wrote to me calling my attention to the school histories of Prof. Allen C. Thomas of Haverford College, Pa., and I have since procured them, one for middle grades and one for upper grades. I would like to direct the attention of your readers particularly to his larger "History of the United States," for the higher grades. For, while it does not depart sufficiently from the prevailing standards to offend old-fashioned boards of education, it occasionally allows the truth to show itself between the lines. For instance, in a note it quotes General Grant's opinion of the Mexican War, namely, that it was "one of the most unjust ever waged by a stronger against a weaker nation." It shows that the moral tone of the country was lowered as a result of the Civil War, and it presents, as a historical fact, the criticisms made by anti-imperialists against the Spanish and Philippine Wars. This is a good beginning, and deserves the support of all lovers of peace. I suggest that we bring this history to the notice of school principals and trustees wherever the opportunity may present itself. It is published by D. C. Heath & Co. of Boston and forms an admirable substitute for the ordinary collections of blood-and-thunder fables which masquerade under the title of American History in our schools, and which are, in fact, rather hysterical than historical. Yours truly,

ERNEST H. CROSBY.

RHINEBECK, N. Y.

The British Friends and the Prime Minister.

A very interesting correspondence has taken place between the British Friends' Yearly Meeting and Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman on the subject of reduction of armaments. The recent Yearly Meeting sent, through its Clerk, Henry Lloyd Wilson, the following address to the new Prime Minister:

"In considering the subject of peace, we have taken note, with thankfulness, of the utterances of the Prime Minister and other members of the government in favor of a reduction of our military and naval expenditure, and we desire to express our earnest wish, first, that some substantial reduction in this expenditure may be carried out with as little delay as possible, and, second, that the government may secure the introduction into the program of the forthcoming Hague Conference of the subject of the limitation of armaments.

"We believe that the evidence of increasing goodwill between the nations, and the proved capacity of the arbitral methods established by the Hague Convention to resolve questions of great international delicacy, as also the appalling revelation of what modern war involves afforded by the Russo-Japanese conflict, make the present an opportune time for endeavoring by friendly agreement to relieve the crushing burden of armaments. We are convinced that the cultivation of goodwill between nations and the steadfast adherence to the policy of brotherliness and justice will more and more be recognized as the surest national defense, and that the policy of huge armaments is subversive of these natural relations of friendship, and often proves a direct provocation to war."

To this address the Prime Minister's Secretary sent the following cordial and sympathetic reply:

To the Secretary of the Society of Friends:

Sir: The Prime Minister desires me to thank you for the minute of the Yearly Meeting of the Society of Friends, in which the earnest wish of the meeting is expressed that some substantial reduction in military and naval expenditure may be carried out with as little delay as possible, and, further, that the government may secure the introduction into the program of the forthcoming Hague Conference of the subject of the limitation of armaments.

In view of the opinions expressed by the Prime Minister and his colleagues, it is hardly necessary to repeat that Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman is in complete and cordial sympathy with these objects, towards the realization of which His Majesty's government are taking all the steps that lie in their power.

The Prime Minister is glad to know that in their endeavors to promote peace and goodwill among the nations the government will have the coöperation of an agency so powerful for good as that of the Society of Friends. I am, sir,

Your obedient servant,

VAUGHAN NASH.

10 DOWNING STREET, WHITEHALL, S. W.,
MAY 31, 1906.

Mr. Carnegie on Reduction of Armaments.

The *Tribune* publishes an interesting interview with Mr. Carnegie on his recent arrival in London, from which we extract the following passage:

"*Question:* The *Tribune* has been fighting to have the question of armaments, in which we know you are interested, brought before the second Hague Conference. Do you favor the idea of a second Peace Crusade for this purpose, and would you be willing to help by coöperating in the United States? And also, perhaps, by paying a visit to us over here and appearing upon European platforms in support of the movement?

"*Answer:* I am delighted with the Prime Minister's position on this question, and am certain President Roosevelt would play a prominent part, as he did between Russia and Japan, if opportunity offered. Congress approved this session building only one battleship, needed to keep the present fleet efficient. This is now the policy of the United States — I think one hundred

and thirteen votes, or perhaps it was one hundred and thirty-three, were cast even against one. This appears to me the psychological moment for nations to come to an understanding not to increase present forces, army or navy — and by and by to decrease.

"*Question:* What of Mr. Bartholdt's proposal to defer the building of a battleship if the Hague Conference should suggest settlement of disputes by arbitration?

"*Answer:* That commanded a surprisingly large vote. By all means, we should ask the coming Conference to take up the subject. An International Commission might be appointed, charged to investigate and report to the powers what, in their opinion, each should do in order to keep present fleets only relatively as strong as now, and in what way reduce them, keeping each relatively as strong. The powers to reserve the right to act as deemed proper. One advance we may expect from the coming Conference — immunity of private property at sea, now that Britain favors it. Another, I hope, is to be a declaration that speculative claims or any business claims of promoters in foreign lands are no longer to be collected by governments; that private investors abroad must take accompanying risks.

"*Question:* Will you kindly repeat your views as to the putting of the peace movement upon a business basis; especially will you please tell us of your intentions in regard to the Palace of Peace at The Hague; and generally give us any suggestions you have for the furtherance of the cause of international arbitration and an arrest of armaments?

"*Answer:* I think that our President, representing a country outside the vortex of militarism, which has no territorial ambitions, and has nothing to fear, having not one enemy in the world, is the most available potentate for proposing to other powers a reduction of armaments. All would know that America is not financially pressed — on the contrary, no nation ever increased in wealth or population as America is now increasing; also, that America has no desire for additional foreign possessions, nor need for them. President Roosevelt would be listened to. I hope he is meditating such a service to the world."

ADDRESSES AT THE TWELFTH ANNUAL MOHONK CONFERENCE ON INTERNATIONAL ARBITRATION.

Armaments and the "Next War."

OPENING ADDRESS OF HON. JOHN W. FOSTER, PRESIDENT.

Ladies and Gentlemen: We congratulate ourselves on the assembling of the twelfth annual Conference on International Arbitration to-day with the reign of peace among all the nations of the earth. At former meetings there have been in progress the Japanese-Chinese and the Spanish-American wars, the Philippine insurrection, the Boer war, the Boxer outbreak in China, the British expedition to Tibet, and the great Russo-Japanese war. The temple of Janus now stands closed. Let us hope its votaries may have no occasion to open it in our day.

The hopeful promise now is, not only that peace reigns, but that the nations are striving to preserve peace. The third meeting of the American States is about to occur at Rio de Janeiro to concert measures for greater harmony in their work of developing commerce, industry, intelligence and justice. And it is proposed that this assembly in the Western Hemisphere shall be followed soon by another Conference of all the nations of the world at The Hague in the interest of peace and humanity. The gratifying feature of this second Conference in Europe is that it is responded to with alacrity by all the governments, in striking contrast with the hesitation and jealousy which marked the first convocation. Another interesting feature is that while twenty-six governments were represented at the Conference of 1899, forty-seven have been invited to participate in the second Peace Conference, including all the American States and Ethiopia. It will be the first time in the history of the human race when all the independent nations have come together to confer on their mutual interests. Verily the world is moving on towards the era of peace and goodwill among men.

With this inspiring picture before us, I regret to have to direct your attention to another phase of the coming World's Congress which is not so encouraging. The main object of the first Hague Conference was expressly set forth in the program to be the limitation of the armaments of the nations. Of late the Emperor of Russia has been the subject of severe criticism, and even of malediction. I am pleased to say that too much praise cannot be bestowed upon his rescript convoking the Conference of 1899. No more forcible statement has ever been published of the economic evils of war and of the unwisdom and hurtful effects of the maintenance of the vast armies and navies of the great powers of Europe. I have no doubt that the Czar at that time sincerely desired that a limitation might be placed upon these extravagant and dangerous expenditures, but the Conference did not have the courage or the will to meet this mighty issue. We have the authority of one of the prominent members of that body, Baron d'Estournelles de Constant, for the statement made recently in the French Senate, that the Conference in "its first purpose had failed. . . . But all was not lost. . . . From fear of offending public opinion and lest it end in complete failure, the permanent arbitration court was created, and in spite of the tacit dislike which at first crippled it, it has begun to live. . . . On the initiative of President Roosevelt, the Hague Court, boycotted by Europe, was set on its feet and saved."

Happily, the boycott of Europe did not extend to America, and M. de Constant justly gives the credit to President Roosevelt for having saved the Conference from complete failure. However great may be the other services of our President to his country and mankind, I believe that history will record this act as his worthiest claim to lasting fame.

The first call for the Second Peace Conference was issued during the progress of the Russo-Japanese war by President Roosevelt, but after its close the Emperor of Russia asked and was accorded the privilege of sending out the formal convocation. The discouraging feature of it to which I have alluded is that in the program of subjects to be considered the limitation of armaments has not been included. It was hardly to be expected that this measure would be suggested by the power whose armies so recently had been driven

from the field and its navy annihilated. But it is of equal importance with the general acceptance of the principle of arbitration that some measure shall be adopted to put a stop to this ever-increasing competition of the great powers in the enlargement of their standing armies and navies. It is a mockery of sincerity and consistency solemnly to enter into treaty compacts for the settlement of international disputes by peaceful arbitration while the high contracting parties continue to strain to the utmost their taxing capacity and their credit in preparations for war.

I recognize that the limitation of armaments is encompassed with many difficulties, but it is no more impossible of realization than a general arbitration treaty seemed a few years ago. Nor are we without examples to show that it is possible of practical application. The two southernmost republics of this hemisphere for a generation or more regarded each other as natural enemies, and they taxed their people to the stretch of endurance to keep their armies and navies on a war footing. But finally, realizing the folly and wickedness of such a policy, they recently entered into a treaty of amity and disarmament, they have reduced their military forces to police necessities, and sold their battleships and cruisers, or converted them into merchant vessels. Thus Chile and Argentina by disarmament guarantee each other's peace and autonomy. At the close of the war of 1812 the United States and Great Britain agreed to a disarmament of their large naval establishments on the Great Lakes, where fierce conflicts had taken place. A treaty fixed the limit of their armed vessels on those extensive internal seas, and for nearly a century we and our Canadian neighbors have lived in peace, and the immense commercial shipping of those waters has felt no need of vessels of war to protect it. What the Argentine and Chilean republics and the two great Anglo-Saxon nations have done is feasible for all the nations soon to assemble at The Hague.

The subject which Russia did not feel warranted in suggesting, I am confident will be inserted in the program; in fact, it has already been anticipated by President Roosevelt, by the reference he made in his last annual message to "the limitation of the armed forces on land and sea, and of military budgets" as one of the matters of business undisposed of in 1899 and desirable to be considered in the new Conference. The omission has also attracted the attention of the British government, and during the present month a resolution has been adopted by the House of Commons calling for the inclusion of the question.

I earnestly hope our government will follow up the indication made in the message of the President, and that its delegates to The Hague will take the lead in bringing about an agreement among the great powers for a limitation and, if possible, a reduction in armaments. But I do not lose sight of the fact that even in our own country the proposition does not meet with universal favor, that there is abroad in this land a chauvinistic spirit of militarism, and a disposition to belittle the efforts of the friends of peace. So intelligent a person as he who now honors the post of secretary of the navy is reported as saying in a recent address that peace societies have never improved the conditions under which war is waged, and that the increased humanity of warfare has come about through the efforts of warriors. He seems to have forgotten that Grotius, the author of *De Jure Belli et Pacis*,— a work which more than any other has reformed the excesses of war,— was a divine, a jurist and the greatest modern apostle of peace; also that when it became necessary to frame a code for the government of the armies of the United States during the Civil War, which would respond to the humanitarian sentiments of the age, President Lincoln entrusted the task, not to a warrior, but to a college professor and a sociologist, Dr. Lieber.

We have the following gloomy view of the state of the country from Senator Hale, the veteran statesman and experienced chairman of the Senate Committee on Naval Affairs, uttered a few weeks ago: "The trouble is, Mr. President, that under the incitement that the military sentiment is constantly pushing us forward to, with every officer of the army and navy eager and anxious for a complication that will bring us into war, the public attention is drifting away from the tremendous problems that at home are clutching at the foundations of our entire social, business and political fabric."* The War and Navy Departments are constantly appealing to Congress for increased appropriations to put them in proper condition for war. The lately retired Commanding General of the Army has announced in a public address that we must prepare ourselves for the next war, and a prominent admiral of the navy goes so far as to indicate the nation which is to be our next antagonist.

Why this constant harping on the "next war," when there is no human probability of having one? If we attend to our own business and allow other nations to attend to theirs, there will be no occasion for armed conflicts on our part. I do not believe in "the white man's burden," in the sense indicated by the jingo British poet, the author of the phrase. Our mission as a people, living in security on this continent, separated by wide oceans from any other great military power, is to maintain here a model republican government and democratic institutions which shall stand as a beacon of hope for the oppressed of all countries, to develop our marvelous resources, to encourage commerce, industries, and intelligence, and by our example promote peace and justice among mankind.

Since the war of 1812, for nearly a century, we have been free from the aggressions of any power. Our two foreign wars in that period of time have been provoked by us with weak and almost defenseless nations, and might with honor to ourselves have been avoided. There never was less danger than to-day of the American Union being exposed to the unfriendly or hostile action of other nations. Why then should we enter into the competition of the great powers of Europe for standing armies and formidable navies? A century and a half ago, when Europe was indulging in the Seven Years' War, Montesquieu, a philosopher a hundred and fifty years ahead of his time, wrote of the armaments of that day, which he describes as "a new disease spread throughout Europe . . . which becomes infectious, for as soon as one state increases its forces, the others at once increase theirs; so that nothing is gained by it except general ruin . . . And this struggle of all against all is called peace!"

*Congressional Record, Vol. 40, No. 25, p. 1100, January 16, 1906.

How little have the rulers of our day profited by the lessons of history. The late Secretary of the Navy advocated the increase of the American navy to an equal place with the most formidable sea power of the world. Great Britain launches the *Dreadnaught*, and Congress is immediately besieged and implored to appropriate the millions necessary to build a larger and more destructive monster. France follows in the same direction, and Germany sets her builders at work to eclipse all others. It is high time the peace-loving people of America should call a halt in our naval expenditures. We have the authoritative statement of the Chairman of the Committee on Appropriations of the present Congress, made in the House only a few days ago, *that the appropriations for the navy by the last two Congresses amounted to $388,108,715, or more than twice as much as it would cost to build the Panama Canal; that we are expending for the current fiscal year $375,659,719 for military purposes, or sixty-four per cent of the total expenses of the government; and that as a consequence no appropriations can be made for the necessary demands of commerce in river and harbor improvements and for public buildings, or the people must have new taxes levied upon them to meet these enormous war expenditures. Such being the issue, the discussion of the limitation of our armament is likely to pass from the peace societies to the over-burdened taxpayers. Our legislators, who have been deaf to the appeals of the friends of peace and arbitration, may meet a reckoning at the ballot-box.

I would not have you understand that I am advocating peace at any price. If you will excuse a personal allusion, I will say that I have given nearly four of the best years of my life to active military service in the greatest war of modern times. I believe with President Roosevelt, as expressed in his message already quoted, that there have been, and may be in the future, righteous wars, and I would, as he expressed it, "follow the path which leads towards righteousness, even though that path leads to war." But I also believe that in the present stage of the world's progress most wars may be avoided, and if the powerful nations will unite in compulsory arbitration, all aggressive wars may be prevented. I also believe that the measure next to, if not equal in importance with, compulsory arbitration, to secure the world's peace is the limitation and diminution of the armaments of the great powers.

I must not close without making reference to the dark shadow which has passed over our country since we last met. In the death of John Hay, Secretary of State, peace and arbitration lost one of their stoutest and most influential champions. But the inspiration of his example and his words remain to strengthen our faith in the ultimate triumph of the cause so near his heart.

*Hon. James A. Tawney, Cong. Rec. Vol. 40, No. 128, p. 7311. May 19, 1906.

A Common International Consciousness and a Common International Life.

ADDRESS OF REV. LYMAN ABBOTT, D.D.

If the distinguished lawyers and jurists who are here present discover some errors in what I shall have to say respecting the development of law, I hope they will temper their justice with mercy in their subsequent criticisms.

I think it was one of the fathers of the Revolution who said that the only light on the path of the future was that shed by the lamp of experience. What does the development of law in the individual and then in the community indicate respecting the future development of law which we are to look for and to hope for among the nations of the earth? Every act oft repeated becomes a habit; habit long continued becomes a second nature. Thus we, as individuals, grow into a subjection to the laws of our own nature which we have ourselves helped to make. But we are not, as the author of Omar Khayyam insists, billiard balls, knocked hither and yon without a word; on the contrary, we have an intelligence which is able to understand these laws, and a will which is able to modify them. We can see in what direction our habits are leading us, and then we can, if we will, change, or modify, or absolutely reverse them. And, finally, with these habits and with this intelligence to understand and apply the laws of our own nature that grow out of our habits, and this will to resolve to do the thing which our intelligence directs us to do, there is a power to execute that which our will has resolved.

The comparison of the individual to the state is at least as old as Plato. The state also has its personality; the state grows as an individual grows. First, there are customs; these customs, continued, come by-and-by to have the force of law. These laws, long continued and persisted in, become the second nature of the state; that is, its constitution. But the state has an intelligence to understand these laws, to interpret them and to apply them; not merely the intelligence of the eighty millions of individuals, but an organic intelligence,—a crystallized, central intelligence. That intelligence which understands and interprets and applies these laws is the court.

It is not merely the function of the court to determine questions at issue between individuals. It might almost be said that this is its minor function. Its chief function is to interpret the nature and order of development of the nation to itself. It has been well said that Chief Justice Marshall did quite as much in the forming of the United States Constitution, as we have it to-day, as was done by any of those who helped to frame it and signed their names to it. In our own time and in the last few years, I do not think it is too much to say that the Supreme Court of the United States has done as much to guide the nation in the new channels and the new life on which it is entering as Congress has done. The court is the intelligence of the community applied to the problem of its customs, its habits, its state or national life.

But this state has not only an intelligence to understand; it also has a will by which it can vary its customs, and this will is expressed through the legislature. As the courts are the intelligence to understand and apply, so the legislature is the will to enact and determine; and, finally, there is an executive force to put this will into effect.

Now in the development of our international life we can trace some of these successive stages that we see in the individual and in the community. At first every

nation was a pure individualist in its national capacity; it cared only for itself, absolutely indifferent toward all other nations, and the only international law was the law of the strongest, the only international code, every nation for itself. Nation made war against nation whenever it thought it could get anything by making war. The law of the wild beast of the forest was the law of the warring, contending nations. It was found inconvenient; it was found disadvantageous, and then, no matter how, there grew up gradually a moral development of man and the inhumanity of it was seen.

In the olden time, when prisoners were taken, they were killed, they were flayed alive, they were tortured; the pictures and emblems of this are on the old drawings, on the old inscriptions of the ancient world. But after a little, the conquering nation saw that it could do something better than flay prisoners alive; it could make slaves of them and set them to work. So slavery came as the product of war. It was better to make a man work for you than to flay him alive. Then it was discovered that a community could enrich itself more by not making its captives slaves, but by bringing them into the community and making them free men. Thus freedom took the place little by little of slavery.

So, without going into detail, international customs respecting the conduct of war grew up just as customs grow up in state, just as habits grow up in the individual. Then the intelligence of the separate nations began to see these customs, see what they meant, what they ought to mean, how they ought to be modified in order to do justice or to conduce to the welfare of the individual nation, and international questions were brought before state courts and the state court exercised its judgment on the international custom. But the intelligence of the different nations did not agree and their customs did not agree. If my memory serves me right, the courts of Great Britain hold that coal is not contraband of war; but the courts of Russia hold that coal is contraband of war. There is the custom and an intelligence applied to the custom, but not as yet a common intelligence unifying and harmonizing the custom everywhere. Now and again treaties were concluded in which there was some attempt made to adjust these customs and to bring about some kind of agreement.

Finally, as the last step in this progress of international unification, came the Hague Tribunal. This Tribunal was not merely a contrivance for putting an end to war, not merely a means for settling individual quarrels between this nation and that nation; but it had for its object, at all events, I think, in the minds of the greatest statesmen, something more, — it was to be the international intelligence of the civilized world, the organized expression of the thought of the civilized world respecting the justice and righteousness which one people owes to another people, one nation to another nation. It was the organized intellect and organized conscience of civilized humanity.

Now, what is the next step? Why, the next step is the organized will of the civilized community of nations. It is true that in the history of nations the executive has generally preceded the legislative, and that is because despotism preceded liberty. First you have a Cæsar or a Czar, later a legislative assembly. Because at first the people have no intelligence, no organized intelligence, no organic will; they have a great many different wills and thoughts and opinions, but no organized intelligence, no organized will, and they are subject to the intelligence and the will of the imperial dictator, the Napoleon, the Cæsar, the Czar. But just as soon as the nation comes to national consciousness, just as soon as it begins to have a national will, it demands a legislature. Why? I suppose there is not a mother in this room that has not had the experience of a child organizing in himself a douma, and she has been just as much puzzled to know what to do with the child with a douma as the Czar of Russia is puzzled what to do with the Douma. And if I may be allowed to put in a parenthesis to the mothers, I advise you to adjust yourselves to the douma of the child and not to attempt to repress or destroy it. But that is in passing.

Just as soon as the nation begins to get a corporate intelligence it must have a court; just as soon as it begins to get a corporate will, it must have a legislature. Now we have already organized our corporate intelligence. It is here, and our next step is to bring to this corporate intelligence the problems of justice that perplex us, to settle them, not by our pride, not by our selfishness, but by our brain. When I say that the Supreme Court of the United States is the brain of the United States, I do not mean to say that all the brains of the United States are in the judges of the Supreme Court; nor when I say that the Hague Tribunal is the brain of the civilized world, do I mean that all the brains of the civilized world are in the Hague Tribunal. What I mean is this: if the community is to act as an organism, it must have an organized thought, and if the civilized world is to act as an organism it must have an organized court; and what the Supreme Court of the United States is, — the organ of the thought of the United States in its interpretation of the customs and the life of the nation, — such the Hague Tribunal is to the civilized world, the interpretation of the organic thought of the civilized world in relation to the problems of international justice and peace.

But having that, we must have the next thing, the organized will. We must have some organ by which, as the community acts as a community, so the nations of the world can act also as a community; and that is the International Parliament. We have had some tentative experiments in this direction. There have been congresses of the nations for one thing or another. Perhaps the most notable of these is the Postal Union Congress, which does not, indeed, have as yet legislative power, if I understand the facts aright. The Postal Union has no legislative authority to determine what shall be the postal laws of the different nations, but its recommendations, unless I am mistaken, have always been practically adopted. It is an advisory parliament on postal matters, representing not merely the intelligence, but the will of all the nations that are brought together through the post.

We have our Pan-American Congress, which as yet is not a permanent body, but which I think we shall learn here before this session is over is likely soon to become a permanent body, again representing not merely the intelligence and thought, but working toward an expression of the will of the people of all the Americas.

We have the Interparliamentary Union, which as yet

has had no official recognition, if my memory serves me right, from the different governments, although it is composed of persons that go from the different parliaments. The next step, now, is an official organization of that Interparliamentary Union, with advisory powers at first that shall become legislative powers in turn by and by.

First comes an organic intelligence of the nations, next an organic will of the nations, and next an organic executive power of the nations, — and less armament? Yes. How shall we determine how much less armament? Why, just as long as you have this conception that England must have her armies and navies to protect her interests, that America must have her army and navy to protect her interests, and France the same, just so long you will have more or less of competition between the contending nations, each determined at least to be strong enough to resist its neighbor if it is attacked. It may be that Russia is the only country that would object to less armament, but I suspect that so long as she objects, Japan will object too. Napoleon undertook to make all Europe one great empire without a national consciousness, without a national intelligence, or a national will, focussing all in his own brain. Europe not merely combined in intelligence, in law, in will, but it combined also in force, and it put force, the military forces of Europe, under the direction of a common leader to protect every nation from the one whom they regarded as the foe of all the nations. The Boxer movement threatened representatives of every nation. We did not send to their relief a Japanese force under a Japanese commander, a German force under a German commander, an English force under an English commander, and an American force under an American commander; we said, "Here is police duty to be done," and the police forces were put under one man and marched to Pekin, — English, German, French, and Japanese, under a German commander.

Here, as I take it, we are to dream dreams and see visions. The young men and the old men are to dream dreams and see visions. That is what we are at Lake Mohonk for, and so I make no apology or excuse whatever for saying what is my dream and my vision. It is this: The time is coming when all the military forces of the civilized world will be one police force, under one chief of police, with one international legislature, to decide what is the will of the nations, and with one international court to interpret the official and legal intelligence of the nations. There will be just enough army and just enough navy to make the world safe, under a common direction and a common control, and no more. [Applause.] To-day Europe is pretending to dread "the yellow peril." Possibly a few Europeans do, but I do not think any very sane ones do. China really does dread the white peril, and has reason to. How shall we obviate this difficulty? How shall we of the west avoid the yellow peril, and they of the east avoid the white peril? There are two ways: One way is, that we build up armies and navies and get ready for the worst war the world has ever seen; the other way is to say, An end to this way of settling difficulties. China, Japan, Russia, Europe and America, — we will have a common intelligence through a court; we will form a common will through an Interparliamentary Union, and we will form a common chief of the police, call him what you will. This is the sane way. It is the righteous way. It is the way in which lies peace.

The world is moving very fast, — very fast. When Edward Everett Hale, in 1895, said here, "We want a permanent court of arbitration, a permanent tribunal," there were men on this floor, you remember, who said, "This is the dream of the dreamer, and the vision of the visionary." In four years we had it. It is pretty hard to keep ahead of God. Just now he is moving fast. He has run ahead of the chariot. He has girt up his loins and run rapidly. What we want to-day — well, what I want — is not a court merely to settle individual difficulties. We have got that already. Not merely a body of men is wanted to come together and consult on international matters, though we are going to have that. What I want to see is a common international consciousness and a common international life. The Psalmist said, "The kings of the earth take counsel together against the Lord and against his anointed," and they certainly did. What we want is that the kings of the earth shall take counsel together for the Lord and for his anointed. Paul said, "The kingdom of God" — what is it? "Righteousness, peace and joy." What we want is a common international consciousness, interpreted by a common international tribunal, expressing itself in a common international will, — a parliament, enforced by a common international executive, that shall make for justice, for peace and for human welfare. [Applause.]

The Triumphs of Peace.

ADDRESS OF CARDINAL GIBBONS.

Nearly two thousand years have rolled by since the birth of the Prince of Peace, whose advent was announced by the angelic host singing, "Glory to God in the highest, and on earth peace to men of goodwill." Christ's mission on earth was to establish a triple peace in the hearts of men, — peace with God by the observance of his commandments, peace with our fellowmen by the practice of justice and charity, and peace within our own breasts by keeping our passions subject to reason, and our reason in harmony with the divine law. When looking back and contemplating the wars that have ravaged the Christian world during the last twenty centuries, some persons might be tempted at first sight to exclaim in anguish of heart that the mission of Christ has been a failure. My purpose, in the brief remarks which I shall make, is to disabuse the faint-hearted of this discouraging impression.

It is by comparisons and contrasts that we can most effectually gauge the results of Christian civilization. Let us compare the military history of the Roman Empire with the military record of our American Republic. In pagan Rome war was the rule, peace the exception. The temple of Janus in Rome was always open in time of war, and was closed in time of peace. From the reign of Romulus to the time of Augustus Cæsar, seven hundred years, the temple of Janus was always open except twice, when it was closed for six years. The United States has existed as a sovereign nation for about one hundred and twenty years, since the close of the Revolution. During that period we have had four wars:

the War with England from 1812 to 1815, the War with Mexico, the Civil War and the recent Spanish War. The combined length of these campaigns was about ten years. Hence we see that the United States has enjoyed twelve years of peace for every year of war, while the Roman Empire enjoyed less than one year of tranquillity for every century of military engagements. I may remark in passing that at least three of these four military campaigns might have been easily averted by peaceful arbitration, and that a large share of the responsibility rests at our doors that this was not the case.

But the blessed influence of Christian civilization has been experienced not only in reducing the number of wars, but still more in mitigating the horrors of military strife. Prior to the dawn of Christianity, the motto of the conqueror was: "Woe to the vanquished." The captured cities were pillaged and laid waste. The wives and daughters of the defeated nation became the prey of the ruthless soldiery. The conquered generals and army were obliged to grace the triumphs of the victors before they were condemned to death or to ignominious bondage. Alexander the Great, after the capture of the city of Tyre, ordered two thousand of the inhabitants to be crucified, and the remainder of the population were put to death or sold into slavery. How different was the conduct of General Scott after the successful siege of the city of Mexico. As soon as the enemy surrendered not a single soldier or citizen was sacrificed to the vengeance of the victorious army, and not a single family was exiled from their native land. During the siege of Jerusalem in the year 70 of the Christian era, under Titus, the Roman General, more than a million Jews perished by the sword or by famine. Nearly one hundred thousand Jews were carried into captivity. The sacred vessels of the temple of Jerusalem were borne away by the blood-stained hands of the Roman army. Let us contrast the conduct of Titus towards the Jews with General Grant's treatment of the defeated Confederate forces. When General Lee surrendered at Appomattox Courthouse, he and his brave army were permitted to return without molestation to their respective homes. The Roman and the American General, in their opposite conduct, were reflecting the spirit of the times in which they lived. Titus, in exercising cruelty towards the vanquished, was following the traditions of paganism. Grant, in his magnanimity toward the Confederate troops, was obeying the mandates of Christian civilization.

And now, friends and advocates of international arbitration, permit me to greet you with words of good cheer and congratulation. You are engaged in the most noble and benevolent mission that can engross the attention of mankind, — a mission to which are attached the most sublime title and the most precious reward, "Blessed are the peacemakers, for they shall be called the children of God." I beg you to consider what progress has already been made in the beneficent work in which you are enlisted. A hundred years ago disputes between individuals were commonly decided by a duel. Thanks to the humanizing influence of a Christian public opinion, these disagreements are now usually adjusted by legislation or conciliation. Have we not reason to indulge the hope that the same pacific agencies which have checked the duel between individuals will, in God's own time, check the duel between nations?

In our schoolboy days, the most odious and contemptible creature we used to encounter was the bully who played the tyrant toward the weak, but cringed before his strong companions. But still more intolerable is a bullying nation that picks a quarrel with a feeble nation with the base intent of seizing her possessions. Friends and advocates of international arbitration, let it be your mission to protect the weak against the strong; and then to the ruler of a feeble nation may be applied the words of the poet:

"Thrice is he armed who hath his quarrel just."

He is armed with the consciousness of the sacred right of property. He is armed with the shield of an enlightened public opinion. He is armed with the conviction that his cause will be adjudicated by the equitable decision of a board of arbitration.

This amicable system, while protecting the rights of the weak, will not wound or humiliate the national pride of the strong, since it does not attempt to trench on the sovereignty or autonomy of the stronger power. I can recall at least four instances within the last twenty years in which international conflicts have been amicably settled by arbitration. The dispute between Germany and Spain regarding the Caroline Islands was adjusted by Pope Leo XIII in 1886. The Samoan difficulty between Germany and the United States was settled by a conference held in Berlin in 1889. A treaty of peace between the United States and Mexico was signed in Washington at the close of Cleveland's administration. And a few weeks ago a war between France and Germany — perhaps a general European conflict — was averted by the Algeciras Conference.

Let us cherish the hope that the day is not far off when the reign of the Prince of Peace will be firmly established on the earth, and the spirit of the gospel will so far sway the minds and hearts of rulers and cabinets that international disputes will be decided, not by standing armies, but by permanent courts of arbitration, — when they will be solved, not on the battlefield, but in the halls of conciliation, and will be adjusted, not by the sword, but by the pen, which "is mightier than the sword." May the nations of the earth study and take to heart this lesson, that "peace hath her victories no less renowned than war," victories more substantial and more enduring. May they learn that all schemes conceived in passion and fomented by lawless ambition are destined, like the mountain torrent, to carry terror before them, and leave ruin and desolation after them; whilst the peaceful counsels of men assembled, as you are, under the guidance of Almighty God, are sure to shed their silent blessings around them, like the gentle dew of heaven, and to bring forth abundant fruit in due season.

The United States Should Take the Lead in Limitation of Armaments.

ADDRESS OF JUSTICE DAVID J. BREWER OF THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT.

Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen: I did not intend to say anything when I came here. I came to listen and to learn; but I do move the adoption of this

platform [just presented by Dr. Gilman], although it does not come up to my desires. I believe, however, that half a loaf is better than no bread. I am used to frequent contests in a rather contentious court, in which not infrequently I find myself in a minority of four, over-ruled by what we call "a cruel majority of five." I recognize the fact that the great majority of opinion here is in favor of going as far as this platform goes, but no farther. Personally I do believe, however, in the full scope of what was said by Dr. Abbott and our President. I do believe in the wisdom of that resolution [asking Congress to defer appropriations for new warships, at least until after the second Hague Conference] offered by Mr. Paine [applause]; I believe in the wisdom of this conference taking the highest ground, and I believe the result in the long run would be beneficial.

It is said as a matter of history that when the great convention met in Chicago, before the Civil War, which ended in the nomination of Abraham Lincoln, when the effort of the leaders was to frame a platform which should not offend too much the business interests of the North, one was drafted which contained no reference to the Declaration of Independence. When it was read and presented to the convention, having been carefully prepared so as not to offend, a young Republican, a member of that convention, arose and moved that the convention endorse the Declaration of Independence . . . The influence of that act swept through the country, and Abraham Lincoln was President!

Now, there are two lines of objection to an advanced declaration in reference to the objects of this Conference, the desire for universal peace and the settlement of all disputes by arbitration. Those lines are not perhaps both represented here. One is the line of timidity and hesitation, the other is the line of business interest. There are many, as appears here, who say they believe fully in limitation of military and naval armaments, who really wish that this country would take the lead in this,— and no country is so able to take the lead and so safe in doing it as this. [Applause.] But they say that the men in charge of public affairs at Washington know the condition of things better than we do, and that if we go too far we shall offend them, and that they will fail of accomplishing anything — that it is better to move slowly and educate and crystallize public sentiment before insisting that this nation shall take the lead in the limitation of armaments, military and naval.

It has been said here by my friend, Mr. Findlay, that we have become a world-power, that Manila and Santiago led up to Portsmouth and enabled us to bring about peace between Russia and Japan. That was a fine epigrammatic statement, but I fear that it does not accord with the lessons of history. When an American laid the Atlantic cable, he joined this continent to the old continent, and the business men of this land, so magnificently represented here last night, were thereby brought into touch with those of all nations, and all nations were brought into one family, the family of nations. [Applause.] It is the tremendous accumulation of resources, the wonderful extent of our industries, that have brought all nations into the close relationship which they now sustain to us. There is where we have the power, exercised wisely and nobly by President Roosevelt. But the power was in the people back of him, and in the force which they had been accumulating through years and decades of commercial industry.

There is not any danger to this country. We could stop our military and naval armaments to-day with absolute safety. [Applause.] There is not a nation on the face of the globe that will attack us. If there is war between this country and a European nation, it will be because we commence it. Talk about the prowess of this nation! It was my pleasure, and perhaps that of some of you, to be present at what they called the "Last March of the Grand Army of the Republic," some six or eight years ago in Washington. The Grand Army met there and marched through Pennsylvania Avenue from the Peace Statue down in front of the White House. All day long, from early morning till night, those men marched through the streets. They carried no weapons. The Grand Army cap was the only thing that told that they had been veterans on the battlefield; and yet as they marched firmly all the livelong day, a hundred thousand strong, in front of the reviewing stand, I felt, as I never felt before, thrilled with the magnificent strength of this nation and the certainty that it was safe against the assault of every nation in the world! [Applause.] I have seen a parade of thirty thousand soldiers,— artillery, cavalry and infantry,— with all their arms and equipment; I have been in our fortifications with their immense guns moved by machinery as easily as a boy moves a toy pistol; I have been on our great ironclads and seen those wonderful engines of death,— but I never felt in my life such a sense of the power and strength of this nation as when I saw those unarmed veterans march silently down the avenue before the Chief Executive of the nation! And when to them you add those gallant soldiers who fought under Lee, and who now are loyal to the Stars and Stripes as they were to the Stars and Bars, you may be sure that no nation will attack us. When I say that I felt that sense of the power of this nation, it was not confined, that feeling, to myself alone. Many a diplomat from foreign nations, as I know, looked at that procession and felt that here was a nation that it was not safe to attack.

So I do believe that it would have been wise, if we could all have agreed in it, to have made a distinct declaration that it is the sense of this Conference that this nation should take the lead in the limitation of armaments, military and naval. If our nation would do this, we could then go before the next Hague Conference and say, "We are doing it; follow in our footsteps!" [Warm applause.]

Passing a little from that, I do think that we must realize the growing feeling in favor of peace and arbitration. The great heart of the American people beats in sympathy with that movement. It is no longer to-day a question to be settled by monarchy or parliament or by congress alone. The common people — the people upon whom Abraham Lincoln rested — are the ones who are ruling this country and will rule the world, and you may be sure that the great heart of the common people of this land beats warmly and strongly in favor of peace and arbitration, and they will stand by and support every effort in its behalf; and one day (for all

law is simply the crystallizing into force of public opinion) they will see to it that it is crystallized into the law of this nation, and with this nation into the law of the world, that disputes between the nations as between individuals shall be settled by law and by the courts, and not by force and bullets. I beg your pardon for trespassing so long. I move the adoption of this platform. [Prolonged applause.]

Work Among College Men and Women.

ADDRESS OF DR. W. H. P. FAUNCE, PRESIDENT OF BROWN UNIVERSITY.

I am very happy to follow Dr. Gilman [report on work in the universities and colleges], both because all of us who are engaged in educational work have been following him, afar off, for the last twenty-five years, and because I profoundly believe in the truth of what he has been saying, and in the ripeness of the field that he has been indicating.

In that old city where I have my home and where Mr. Smiley taught for nineteen years, while he was getting his training for international arbitration and for the holding of these conferences, we hold our commencement in the old meetinghouse that was built before the Revolution. On the records of that church you find the quaint inscription, "This meetinghouse was built for the worship of God and to hold commencements in." May we not say of this beautiful room in which we are meeting here, that it was built for the worship of God in the simple friendly service of each morning and to hold commencements in,—the commencement of many a noble aspiration, the commencement of movements for world-wide peace, the commencement of endeavor in all our States and Territories for a truly international life. I think this room was built for that purpose, and perhaps in holding these commencements we are finding the truest worship of Almighty God.

There are some reasons why this work among college men will be specially and speedily fruitful. College men — and what I say applies equally to college women — are naturally hospitable to new ideas, especially when those ideas are large ones. They love a vision. In dealing with them we are not contending with a mass of acquired prejudices; we are not contending with great vested interests, with political hopes and fears; we are dealing with natural idealists, who believe in the to-morrow, who are facing the sunrise, and who, when they see a vision, are swift and energetic in translating it into action. Looking down on five hundred young men every morning is like looking down on so many steam engines standing on the track with steam up. There is no trouble about getting them to go, especially in the Sophomore year, but the trouble is to get them to go on the right rail and move in the right direction. There is a description of old age in the book of Ecclesiastes that is very pathetic. It says "they shall be afraid of that which is high." When a man gets to be afraid of that which is high, of that which is ideal, he is in his dotage whether he be seventeen or seventy. The young man naturally loves the high; he rallies to the ideal; he is glad now and then to attempt the seemingly impossible; and that makes the college field a specially fruitful one,

I want to see the splendid energy of our young college men and women harnessed into the cause of international arbitration. As I have said here before, you know that our young men and women in the college days are getting accustomed, in all their intercollegiate debates and sports and contests of every kind, to the idea of referring all disputed points to umpires and boards of judges. The athletic field is perhaps the clearest expression of the genius and temper and character of the school or the college. There it comes right to the front. It is a student enterprise managed by the students and expresses most clearly their attitude and tone and temper. They are accustomed in every one of their contests to see every disputed point referred to judges, supposed to be impartial; and no decent college man would ever be found kicking, as they say, against the decision of an umpire. The athletic field is a training, not only in endurance and courage and loyalty, but in the principle of arbitration; it is a declaration — the entire athletic system and the intercollegiate system in general — that only he has his quarrel just who is willing to submit it to the impartial judgment of his fellows. And that applies just as truly in international affairs as in intercollegiate contests.

It is most interesting, too, that to-day the most attractive subjects in most universities are found in social and political science. There is nothing to which our students so flock as to courses in social science, in civics, in government, in international ethics and international law. We remember, all of us, how, twenty-five years ago, it was physical science with its dazzling triumphs that drew the majority of our young men; how a little later it was biology, to unravel the secrets of human life; how, still later, they turned to psychology, thinking it would explain the basis of our mental life. But to-day it is the study of the family, society, social institutions, the development of the village community, the city, the state, the nation, our international relations, international law, that is most attractive to a large percentage of our students.

But social science has no patience with the old drum and trumpet histories of the past. It finds more interest in the cabin of the peasant, in the livelihood of the farmer, carpenter and mason, more interest in the struggle and uplift of the laborer than in the man on horseback; and the modern investigator in social and political science finds far more of interest in commercial, industrial and international development than in the parade of cavalry or the clash of swords. I do not believe we shall be able to make college men take much stock in the old fallacious adage that in times of peace we must prepare for war. [Applause.] I thought that fallacy was dead long ago, but I found yesterday it was still alive here and there. I thought we had gotten long past that time. I would rather say that in time of peace we must prepare to make war impossible. What do they mean who use the old adage? They mean that when England builds a *Dreadnaught*, we must build a vessel bigger, and then that England must build a third vessel, larger and more powerful, and that then we must build a fourth still larger and more powerful than the other three. The result of such a course would be clearly preparations for war for centuries to come, practically preparations for war eternal.

I remember when I lived in another city different from the one that is now my home, I was told that in order to protect the family at night and sleep in peace I must purchase a dog. I was not so familiar then with canine proclivities as I have become since, and I invested in a bulldog of ferocious mien and enormous development of the under jaw. For a few days all went well, but I soon found that that bulldog must have something to do. He was not content to sit like a china doll on the front step; he was there for a purpose. One morning, hearing a great uproar, I looked out of the window, and saw the street filled with people standing in a circle, while one of the most venerable men in the community was defending himself with a shovel against that dog of mine. He had torn away the man's coat and was proceeding to attack the nether garments and the limbs when I interfered, and prevented a lawsuit. I made up my mind then that the way to keep the peace is not to place a bulldog in your front yard. [Applause.]

There is another thing that our college men are coming to feel. They are beginning to believe in a newer and finer heroism, which shall give all the development to the audacity and pluck and virility of human nature that war has given, without its sad consequences, its inevitable sorrow. We all love the hero, and we ought to love him; we all love the man that is willing to sacrifice ease and pleasure and life itself for a vocation, and we ought to admire him, and that admiration must never disappear from civilization. All admire the Japanese soldier willing to fling his life away for his Mikado and ancestors. Whether we can understand the service or not, we admire it. But our college men are coming to see that giving one's self for the relief of woe and want, relief of the destitution and sorrow and misery of humanity as we know it in the modern world, requires just as much courage and audacity and pluck and self-sacrifice. I believe they are finding this out. They are finding out that there is the hero not only at the cannon's mouth,—and there is the hero there, and we all acknowledge it,—but also in Arnold Toynbee, sacrificing his life in two short years in service for the poor of East London. We acknowledge the heroism in the life of that brave young American physician who banished yellow fever from Cuba and from the United States, and laid down his brave young life in the attempt. We remember with admiration the heroism of W. T. Norton, when he placed the sponge filled with ether to his nostrils and sank into unconsciousness, that might have been death, for the first time in human history, in order to relieve the world of suffering and pain. We are finding that the heroism of our educated young men and women is exhibited in the life of Jane Addams and Graham Taylor, who have buried themselves for the rest of their lives in the slums of the great western city. This is the kind of genuine heroism that will give the finest fibre of the young manhood and young womanhood of our time all the development it needs. Let us exalt equally the heroes of our great industrial, commercial and social endeavor. Let us not cast disparagement on our great military men of the past, but let us enhance the value of international arbitration, the parliament of man and the federation of the world.

Governor Utter, one of the best executives we have ever had in Rhode Island, went home from this Conference last year full of enthusiasm to do something for college men. At our commencement dinner he asked us if we would take a prize, if he should offer it, for the best debate on this subject and the best essay. I said, "Certainly." He said, "It is to be called the Mohonk prize for the best debate on this subject and the best essay." A few months later we had a debate superior to anything else in interest that we had during the year, and the Attorney-General of the State told me that some of the essays presented, while they might not revolutionize the world, were well worth reading and well worth preserving. Each one of us as we go home may not offer Mohonk prizes, but we may spread the Mohonk influence and inspiration. We can cause something to be done in our own community to spread the influence of the Conference. A similar prize of one hundred dollars was given by Governor Utter to Amherst College in the same way. I doubt not the results there have been equally valuable.

So, Mr. Chairman, I beg leave to move that we accept the report so informing and suggestive and inspiring of Dr. Gilman, and that we continue this same committee for another year to push this work among the college men and women of America.

Constitutional Safeguards Against War.

ADDRESS OF DR. ERNST RICHARD OF COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY.

No less a person than Immanuel Kant has prophesied that war will end when all nations have become republics or have representative governments.

All nations of European civilization have reached the stage of representative government, but his prophecy has not come true. It is therefore of interest to see whether, by their constitution, they show any willingness to prevent war or make it at least more difficult.

An investigation shows that in a number of states the right to declare war without any limitation is vested in the monarch. This cannot be considered as a proof that they intend any reform of ancient customs. The only limitation which is common to all nations that have a constitutional government is found in the right of the Parliament to appropriate the necessary funds for the military and naval establishments and the means of carrying on war. These, however, cannot be refused after the king has made use of his constitutional right and has declared war. It may be said in general that all these limitations are rather intended to be manifestations of sovereignty than safeguards against war.

Of two constitutions which are looked upon as very liberal, the Belgian says (Art. 68): "The King shall command the land and naval forces, make treaties of peace, of alliance, of commerce; he shall give information in respect of the foregoing matters to the two houses as soon as the interest and safety of the state permit it, joining therewith the corresponding communication."

The other constitution referred to is that of Norway. This demands of the King of Norway to advise the Council of State in order to get information about the defensive strength of the country.

The list of states which do not give the executive power, be it monarch or president, the absolute right to declare war may be opened with Germany, whose constitution does not give the Emperor this right except in case of an attack on boundaries or territories of the confederation or its coasts; otherwise, for declaration of war in the name of the empire the consent of the federal council shall be required. In this the Emperor as such has no vote; Prussia, of which he is king, has seventeen votes out of fifty-four.

In most states the power to declare war is vested in Congress, or by whatever name the corresponding bodies are called, giving in some instances the president the authority to do so only with the consent of the Congress; in others the initiative seems to rest entirely with the representatives of the people. In some cases an exception is made by a provision like that in the German constitution; as, for instance, in Colombia, where the President of the republic as the chief executive officer for the nation has the power to declare war with the consent of the Senate, or to do it without such consent whenever it shall be necessary to repel a foreign invasion.

The Colombia constitution, as we see, may serve also as an illustration of those states who give the power of declaring war to one House of Congress only, as a rule to the upper House.

Peculiar is the position of Mexico, where either of the Houses without the intervention of the other may declare war in view of the data which the executive may present, which permits the President to choose the one which is sure to give him the majority.

In the most democratic of all constitutions, that of Switzerland, the President, who in reality is only the chairman of the council, has no part at all in the declaration of war or in the conclusion of peace, which is invested entirely in parliament. As far as the declaration of war is concerned, this agrees with our own constitution, which, however, does not authorize anybody to conclude peace, except as we include it by implication in the treaty power of the President and the Senate.

It will be easily seen that in all these constitutions the intention to make war difficult was not a leading point of view. There are, however, three constitutions which show a tendency against war in a more or less pronounced way. These are, of course, of special interest to us. Of this number, Ecuador holds a position by itself. Here where the executive has the power to declare war when previously decreed by Congress, the President is held responsible for *provoking* an unjust war. This seems a rather wise provision, considering that by the actions of the President a situation may be created which leaves the Congress no choice but to declare war.

The principle of arbitration finds recognition in Venezuela, whose constitution demands, in Article 109, that in international treaties of commerce and friendship this clause shall be inserted: "All disagreements between the contracting parties must be decided without an appeal to war, by the decision of a friendly power or powers."

The most interesting document in this respect is the constitution of Brazil. Article 88 of this constitution says: "In no case, either directly or indirectly, alone or in alliance with another nation, shall the United States of Brazil engage in a war of conquest;" while Article 48 gives the President of the republic the right to declare war at once in case of foreign invasion or aggression. We find, however, that Article 34 says: "The National Congress shall have exclusive power to authorize the government to declare war, if there be no opportunity for arbitration, or, in case of failure of this, to make peace." The constitution of Brazil at once shows the good faith of the nation in its assertions of peacefulness. Thus the government of Brazil answered the invitation extended to it to be represented at the Hague Conference, that there was no necessity for it to do so, as Brazil had anticipated all the conference could do, by making the appeal to arbitration a constitutional duty, and as to its army, it had decreased it already and had sold most of its warships.

No matter what we may read about the internal conditions of the South American Republics, so far as this subject is concerned they have taken decidedly greater steps in civilization than other nations.

We want the United States of America to take the lead in the peaceful settlement of international disputes and to extend the empire of law by strengthening the appreciation of international justice. Could this be done in a more efficient way and shown in a plainer manner than by inserting a similar provision in our own constitution?

I am fully aware that it is considered almost foolhardy to propose an amendment to the United States constitution, although it may be a question of meeting conditions unheard of at the time of its adoption, or of progressive measures not thought of at that period.

This is the case with arbitration, the modest beginning of whose modern development took place only with the Jay Treaty in 1794. To-day an amendment of that kind would mean a lasting gain to civilization, a blessing for all time to come in view of the fact that generation after generation might benefit by it.

Even the number of years it may take to show our people of what advantage such an amendment would be seems of small amount. The continuous agitation connected with an effort for introducing such an amendment would bring the questions involved to the conscience of every citizen and the principles we advocate into every home.

If this fundamental principle of international civilization and organization, with its everlasting benefit, does not seem important enough to warrant the hardships of a campaign for a constitutional amendment, why not try a joint resolution of Congress, which, I am sure, would never be revoked?

I do not think that technical difficulties should prevent us from doing a great service to our country and to all humanity. Of course, there are those who will doubt whether it would be doing a service to our country to compel our government and Congress to give passion time to quiet down, to give justice a chance to be heard, before the nation were rushed into the calamity of war.

It will be said that we cannot tie our hands in this manner. But does not every arbitration treaty as we advocate it involve such a tying of hands? Can we by adopting the principle of arbitration in this manner tie

our hands so as to prevent justice? What harm can it do if time is gained to consider the real causes of our dispute with another nation or to find means of doing justice without the resort to arms?

I do not say that there may not be good reasons to keep the plans and proceedings of our diplomacy secret, but I think a democratic nation has a right to see that it is not rushed or forced into war by its government without knowing that all efforts toward peaceful settlement have been in vain. And this can be secured most effectively in the manner proposed.

The objections made by the opponents of compulsory arbitration at the Hague Tribunal seem to be no other than these two, namely, that arbitration had not been tested sufficiently to be unreservedly adopted, and the claim that there were certain points of national honor which nobody would leave to a third party to decide.

I do not understand why a nation should not submit questions of honor to a tribunal of its equals as well as an individual. In this case the tribunal of arbitration would not be a court of justice, but a court of honor. In those countries where individual war in the shape of the duel has survived to the present day, the first step toward its limitation — and, let us hope, final abolishment — is a demand to have the question at issue submitted to a court of honor, either permanently established or appointed for the purpose, which has to decide whether the honor of the offended party is at stake and whether it is important enough to warrant a fight for life or death. Why should not nations do the same? How much would not be gained if nations would submit similar cases to a court of honor, which, certainly, would be able to prevent in many cases the outbreak of a war, while wisdom and reason had time to raise their voices and wise leaders of the nation to make them "bethink themselves."

I have brought this question before you, not because I hope to be able to persuade you into a declaration in its favor, or even desire to do so, but simply because I think it is important enough to be discussed by you and by the wisest men of the nation. I believe it is worth while to find out whether there are serious objections to the principle. I must confess I have been unable to find any. But let the opponents bring forth their arguments. Let them be examined without prejudice. But if, after careful investigation, we should come to the conclusion that, by making the duty of an appeal to arbitration before declaring war, except in case of actual attack on our boundaries or our coasts, the highest law of the land, we shall not put ourselves at a disadvantage in any right and just cause. We should not hesitate to show our good faith by adopting this course and by showing the way to all mankind, let alone the direct benefit we and our descendants would gain by making it impossible to drive our country into an unjust war.

It is said that treaties will be broken, that mutual distrust between nations will never cease. Still we keep on hoping for new treaties. We expect complete salvation through the action of the Hague Conference. If we really believe in arbitration as a means of international justice, it is our sacred duty to begin ourselves with its establishment. We are strong enough to defy distrust; let us be generous enough to disarm distrust. From the moment we declare that we will not allow any dispute to which we are a party to end in war without trying to settle it by arbitration first, that we will make this an absolute law for our representatives, we shall need no treaties. No nation will refuse to accept our law as its own; no nation will dare to choose arms if we offer justice.

What the Last Year Has Won for Us.

ADDRESS OF A. B. FARQUHAR.

Mr. Chairman: While we know of nothing in the future of which we may be more certain than the final triumph of our sacred cause, the peaceful settlement of international disputes, there is nothing more uncertain than the attempt to show the progress made from year to year — to prove from the events of an immediately preceding twelvemonth that we are nearer to our goal at its close than we were when it began. Had such an annual trial-balancing been undertaken two years ago, for example, when the most conspicuous object on the wide horizon was a colossal war in the East, which had already shown itself to be fearfully destructive and at that time threatened to be of long continuance, then the result would have been discouraging indeed. Now, however, our prospect is altogether different. Within a year the bloody war in Eastern Asia has given place to a peace which promises to be permanent, because of the care and wise moderation with which its provisions were finally drawn; not only that, but that peace was brought about in a way that holds out an excellent promise of application to disagreements between nations in the future. After the treaty of Portsmouth, the event of the year ranking next in importance was the convention of Algeciras, another important instance of a settlement of international differences by pacific methods.

Neither in composing the quarrel between Japan and Russia, as was done so successfully in New Hampshire at the suggestion of President Roosevelt, nor in the Algeciras agreement, was direct use made of the apparatus devised by the Conference of 1899 at The Hague. It must be admitted that the Hague Tribunal, constituted though it was for the very purpose of settling misunderstandings among nations, applicable though it is to any case that may arise, and highly qualified though it may be made to the full measure of the character that the governments forming it are disposed to impress upon it, has nevertheless been too much neglected. Yet the same impulse that was felt in the formation of that tribunal is plainly to be recognized in the agreements that have been reached without recourse to it; and we may therefore be assured that the work at The Hague was by no means wasted.

It is evident, however, that matters must not merely be left to take their own course, either at home or abroad, if we would have the advance steps, upon which we now congratulate ourselves, followed by more and larger strides in the same direction. It is a great triumph that the Russian and Japanese empires should have been brought from the bitterest antagonism to an enduring peace, through the courteous but courageous efforts of the chief of a republic. It is a new triumph when, amid the entanglements arising from the conflicting interests of many nations, a solution of the Moroccan problem should be found in which all of them have freely agreed

to unite, without first exhausting and degrading themselves by an appeal to brute force.

But it is nevertheless to be regretted that these splendid triumphs should have brought no fresh lustre to the Hague Arbitration Court. For any permanent progress of the arbitration idea we must look, not to an occasional and incidental, but to some established agency. Only to something continuing and readily accessible, at all times and to all comers, will mankind form the habit of looking as a matter of course. Our aim is nothing less than to bring about the same revolution in public adjustments that the progress of civilization long ago established in private adjustments: the substitution of courts and civil law for battlefields and bloodshed. And since the reform on the smaller scale has been advanced by devoting to it a fixed course of procedure and fixed tribunals, we have the best of reasons for expecting that the success of the greater reform is to be attained in no other way. It is still the duty, therefore, of all who are interested in bringing this precious blessing to mankind, not to rest satisfied with what has been won for us by irregular agencies, but to urge, with tireless insistance, that a recognized international tribunal, as ready to consider the weighty questions within its scope as is our Federal Supreme Court for what is brought before it, be made in all cases the deciding body.

While laboring unceasingly to give the permanent arbitration tribunal the standing it ought to have among the nations, there are duties at home that must not be neglected. We cannot continue to preach pacific methods abroad without showing, in our conduct among ourselves, our belief in them. Our annual war budget is unnecessarily, absurdly, insanely and wickedly large. We have fortifications along the coast, and war vessels to disport themselves about our seaside resorts and in European ports, in quite sufficient quantity already; and yet the people's money is wasted by the million every year to further inflate the lavish redundancy. Those who have remarked how quickly, in the course of progress in engineering, the fashions in forts and men-of-war become antiquated, are tempted to suspect, from our eagerness to incur these huge expenses, that we may be providing for immediate hostilities in some quarter; and that, since we cannot possibly be anticipating an attack from abroad, we must needs be planning to take the offensive ourselves. There is no real ground for such a suspicion, doubtless, but it has at least the merit of supplying an intelligible motive for what must otherwise appear as a purposeless squandering of the public treasure; worse than a mere waste, because its chief result is to give a mischievous impression of the national purpose and desires. And when we reflect that the money which disappears every year in this way would suffice to give our country and the world the blessings of a Panama Canal, or of thousands of miles of good roads where they are sorely needed, the enormity of our blunder well-nigh passes the limits of the credible.

It seems almost like trifling, however, to pay so much attention to superficial symptoms when we well know that the disorder is deeper-seated — that we must always be in danger of outbreaks of the tiger or bulldog in our nature as long as our moral standards remain unenlightened. When our remote ancestors, emerging from the *pleistocene* and drift ages with no knowledge how to find food except to chase and kill it, and little or no division of industries, felt in another tribe near their hunting grounds the presence of a probable competitor, whom to tolerate might mean starvation, hostilities were natural enough, and it was natural also that thoughts and sentiments and canons of duty should be conformed to this necessity.

But the human race now holds an altogether different position. Industrial civilization began, centuries ago, to replace armed barbarism; men learned to hold commerce — that is to say, a relation of mutual services — with the foreigner, instead of treating him invariably as a competitor and therefore a natural enemy; a universal morality came into being, and in the fullness of time the Sermon on the Mount was preached. There is no reason to suppose that that epoch-making address produced any immediate change in human nature, but it is not easy to think of the relations of men to fellow-men and to the Ruler of the Universe, as having been exactly the same after as before its delivery. In it do we find the standards we uphold, with which we would have humanity square itself. Let all who will, appeal from them to the practices of primeval cave-dwellers and of the tiger and bulldog; we refuse to believe that a true view of national honor is so to be attained.

This is an occasion for encouragement, therefore, but encouragement not to rest content with what the year has won for us, but to strive for more solid victory in the years to come.

The Selection of Arbitrators.

BY STEPHEN H. ALLEN.

That impartiality, intelligence and conscientiousness are indispensable attributes of arbitrators and judges is obvious; how they may most surely be obtained is not so apparent. The method of selection adopted by the Hague Conference and now followed is primitive and objectionable. Each party chooses a part of the arbitrators and, in case they cannot agree on the whole number, those named by the parties select an umpire. The plan is faulty in principle because it starts out with the selection of representatives of the opposing parties, who are to some extent in the attitude of partisans, which of course is inconsistent with the true relation of a judge. Even in the choice of the umpire the arbitrators named by the parties will be expected to seek an advantage. This is the method of selection usually adopted by private persons who have no lists of names furnished by any authority from which to choose, and must therefore adopt some simple plan of making up their tribunals. The same method has been heretofore followed by the nations, when there was no mode of selection provided in advance.

When a general system of international jurisprudence is constructed, however, it is of first importance that the best practicable method of securing the desirable qualities in the members of each tribunal be adopted. The greatest deterrent from arbitration is a lack of confidence in the arbitrators. The method of selection now in use will of course always be open to any powers desiring to follow it. Whatever the opposing parties can agree to is easily within their command, but where a condition of intense distrust exists, as is usually the case

when a great war is brewing, it is hard to overrate the value of a predevised method of adjudication on the conflicting claims, which insures to each party an impartial tribunal.

All the nations joining in the general conference ought of course to be represented in the list of names of those from whom the arbitrators in the different controversies are to be selected. Under present conditions it is probably impracticable to do better than to allow the executive head of each nation to name its representatives from the list. This method may insure as good capacity and high character as any. The general list being made up and many times too numerous to act in a given case, the obvious method of designating the least objectionable, if not the most desirable, ones is to allow the representatives of each nation alternately to strike from the whole list one name at a time until only the requisite number remains. The parties will of course be free to have as large or as small a tribunal as they may agree on, but where they fail to agree on the number it should be fixed by a general rule. For serious controversies perhaps five would generally prove satisfactory. Where all the men named in the list are well qualified to serve, the matter of prime concern is to eliminate prejudice and distrust. The method suggested is that often followed in the selection of jurors in our courts and proves most satisfactory of any. When a general agreement for compulsory arbitration is reached it may possibly be necessary to provide for cases in which one or both parties fail to take part in striking the names. This can be done by authorizing the president of the tribunal or other representatives of all the nations to act for the delinquent party or parties.

The world should deny the moral right of any nation to inaugurate war without having asked arbitration, and should so provide that arbitration when asked will be surely available and no excuse remain for failure to submit to it. Constitutions like that of Brazil, containing a mandatory provision that arbitration be asked before resort to war, will then become fully operative. A definite mode of procedure, clearly pointing out a peaceful path into which either party may lead the other without fear of ambush or pitfall, may be formulated and adopted at the next Hague Conference if the nations are ready for it. The risks of harm through the decision of a tribunal designated in the manner indicated would be infinitesimal as compared with the certainties of loss in war.

TOPEKA, KAN.

The British National Peace Congress.

The third British National Peace Congress was held at Birmingham the second week in June. Between three and four hundred delegates were present. Dr. R. Spence Watson, president of the Peace Society, was chosen chairman. Among the prominent peace workers present were Dr. W. E. Darby, Miss Ellen Robinson, Dr. G. B. Clark, Felix Moscheles, Henry J. Wilson, M. P., Henry Vivian, M. P., John M. Robertson, M. P., John A. Hobson, T. P. Newman, Arthur G. Enock, etc. The delegates were welcomed by Alderman Martineau, who said that such a gathering brought encouragement to "those who lived, so to speak, under the shadow of militarism."

Dr. Watson, at the opening session, portrayed the darker sides of the international situation, but said that cynicism must be avoided and hopefulness preserved. The eyes of the working classes were being opened to the fact that war was made in the "interest of gain, and that though they had with both hands been pouring out money for the military and naval services, they were no safer, or rather not so safe as at the beginning." If the people would only wake up, there would be an end of the matter. They were stronger than all classes, than millionaires, than governments even. The great hope of peace lay in the extension of the principle of arbitration. It had already done an enormous work for good. The Hague Conference ought to consider the reduction of armaments, rather than how to make war less terrible; that could not be done. War was always terrible. Steps should be taken for the ending of wars. The friends of peace were working in the right way. The federation of the world was no idle dream.

A strong resolution, introduced by Ellen Robinson and supported by Dr. Darby, condemned Lord Roberts' scheme of compulsory military training in the schools. An amendment made by Mr. H. Hyndman, of the Social Democratic Federation, asking the Congress to favor a citizen army, with universal military training, was promptly turned down.

Hon. H. J. Wilson, M. P., spoke at the second session, with much appreciation, of the statement made by the French Premier on the 12th of June in regard to reduction of armaments. A resolution was adopted condemning the study of the art of war at the universities as "no part of a liberal education, being neither a science nor a branch of the humanities, and therefore a subject unfit for university study." The statement was made that the movement for such teaching had made great progress at Oxford and Cambridge where it had been found an attractive bait to dangle commissions before the eyes of students. The effort had, however, failed at Manchester, and Alderman Snape mentioned that the War Office had failed to carry through their scheme at the Liverpool University.

The evening of the first day the delegates were entertained at tea by Mr. George Cadbury at Bourneville. In response to a resolution of thanks Mr. Cadbury declared the question of peace to be the greatest question which the world had to face. Money for social reform along many lines was needed, to relieve the sufferings of millions of their fellow subjects. Militarism was the greatest obstacle with which the workingmen in Germany and elsewhere had to contend. For discipline and control, which girls needed as badly as boys, he considered Swedish drill infinitely better than military, and it ought, he said, to be made compulsory in all the schools. Real progress among the nations could be had only as attention was given to "making the lives of the people healthier and happier, instead of destroying them."

On the second day a letter was read from J. Keir Hardie, M. P., in which he said that no movement was "so intimately bound up with the welfare of the workers as that which makes for the peace of nations." The workers of the world had no cause for quarrel, and therefore every one who desired their emancipation

stood for peace. Militarism was the blight of every nation; its influence cursed all whom it touched. He rejoiced that fraternal feelings were spreading in all lands, bringing the workers closer together. The result would be to make war more difficult, and hasten the time when the disease of jingoism would be driven from the body politic.

W. A. Appleton, from the Operative Lace Workers, in a fine speech pleaded for the extension of the peace propaganda to the workers. The great millions of the people had as yet been untouched by it. These people "at the bottom," who admired a display of physical courage, needed to be taught that there were other ways of displaying courage than by killing. He moved, and the Congress, after a number of speeches, unanimously voted, a resolution recommending the interchange of delegates between the Peace and the Coöperative and Trades Union Congresses.

The Congress, on motion of John A. Hobson, pronounced its condemnation of the barbarous methods used in suppressing the Zulu rising, and urged the imperial government to take such measures as would secure the native races in South Africa adequate protection of their lives, liberties and properties whenever assailed by the Colonial governments.

Henry Vivian, M. P., moved a resolution endorsing the action of the House of Commons on the subject of armaments, and expressing the confident hope of "seeing this opinion translated into practical action at an early date." This resolution was supported by John M. Robertson, M. P., and unanimously approved.

At a public meeting in the evening, at which Alderman Baker presided, a number of excellent speeches were made. Hon G. K. Gokhale, of the Supreme Legislative Council of India, condemned the enormous expenditure by the Indian government on the Indian army. Great Britain was adding expense to the overburdened natives by using India as a military depot for the East. What India needed, he declared, was not an army, but money for technical, educational and social reform.

The Congress on the whole seems to have been one of unusual vigor, plainness of speech, and courage in the handling of the questions now so pressing both in Great Britain and elsewhere.

Pamphlets Received.

THE DUTY OF THE UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT TO PROMOTE INTERNATIONAL ACTION FOR RELIEF OF CONDITIONS IN THE CONGO STATE. The Congo Reform Association, Tremont Temple, Boston.

LE PACIFISME ET SES DETRACTEURS. By Emile Arnaud. Paris: Bureaux de la Grande Revue, 9 rue Bleue. 31 pages, octavo.

L'ESPRIT INVISIBLE ET L'AMI DE L'HOMME. By Victor Wasilewski. Paris: A. Nouvian, 96 rue du Bac. 32 pages, octavo.

THE SANTO DOMINGO TREATY AND ITS RELATION TO THE COMMERCIAL INTERESTS OF THE UNITED STATES. Report of the "Committee on Foreign and Insular Trade" of the New York Board of Trade and Transportation.

THE FOUNDATION OF TRUE PROSPERITY, INDIVIDUAL AND NATIONAL. Issued by representatives of the Society of Friends in Philadelphia. Philadelphia: Friends Book Store, 304 Arch Street.

ASSOCIATION OF THE BAR OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK. Annual Reports, etc., 1906. New York: 42 West 44th Street.

WHAT SHALL BE DONE WITH THE PHILIPPINES? Statement of Hon. Moorfield Storey before the Committee of the House of Representatives on Insular Affairs, April 6, 1906.

REMARKS OF FISKE WARREN AND OTHERS, at a luncheon given him at the Twentieth Century Club Rooms on his return from the Philippines. Boston: The Anti-Imperialist League.

NATIONAL GREED VERSUS INDIVIDUAL CHRISTIANITY. As illustrated by our dealings with the Chinese and the Filipinos. By Rev. Charles H. Parkhurst, D.D. A sermon preached in the Madison Square Presbyterian Church, New York City.

LABOR'S BILL OF GRIEVANCES. Speech of Hon. Charles A. Towne of New York, in the House of Representatives, April 5, 1906.

ENEMIS ET AMIS DE PACIFISME. By Gaston de Roy. Tournai, France: J. Rimbaut-Tricot, 12 rue de Cologne. 30 pages.

LA PAIX ET LA GUERRE. By Dr. Charles Richet. Paris, 8 rue de la Sorbonne. 63 pages.

THE AGREEMENT BETWEEN SCIENCE AND RELIGION. By Orlando J. Smith. New York: C. P. Farrell. 32 pages.

BULLETIN DE LA "CONCILIATION INTERNATIONALE," April, 1906 Paris: Ch. Delagrave, 15 rue Soufflot. 105 pages.

HOW SHALL WE 'ESCAPE'? By Leo Tolstoy. The Free Age Press, Christchurch, Hants, England. 14 pages.

POUR L'ARBITRAGE. French edition of Andrew Carnegie's Rectorial Address to the Students of St Andrews. With a Preface by Senator d'Estournelles de Constant. Paris: Ch. Delagrave, 15 rue Soufflot.

LIMITATION AND REDUCTION OF ARMAMENTS. Speech of Hon. Theodore E. Burton of Ohio in the House of Representatives, May 4, 1906.

THE GREAT INIQUITY, THE ONE THING NEEDFUL, AND WORK WHILE YE HAVE THE LIGHT. By Leo Tolstoy. 39 pages, 55 pages, and 64 pages, respectively. The Free Age Press, Christchurch, Hants, England.

RECUEIL DE LEGISLATION DE TOULOUSE, 1905. Toulouse, France: Edouard Privat, 14 rue des Arts.

International Arbitration and Peace Lecture Bureau, 31 Beacon Street, Boston.

The following persons may be secured to give lectures, club talks and addresses before public meetings, churches, schools and other organizations on international arbitration and peace. Those wishing their services should communicate directly with them as to dates and terms.

Mrs. Fannie Fern Andrews, 378 Newbury St., Boston.
E. Howard Brown, Earlham, Iowa.
Ernest H. Crosby, 19 Liberty St., New York City.
W. C. Dennis, State Department, Washington.
Rev. Charles F. Dole, Jamaica Plain, Mass.
Professor Cyrus W. Hodgin, Earlham College, Richmond, Ind.
Dr. George W. Hoss, Wichita, Kansas.
Rev. William G. Hubbard, Columbus, Ohio.
Edwin D. Mead, 20 Beacon St., Boston.
Lucia Ames Mead, 39 Newbury St., Boston.
Dr. Ernst Richard, Columbia University, New York.
Dr. Homer B. Sprague, The Evans, Newton, Mass.
Benjamin F. Trueblood, 31 Beacon St., Boston.

Auxiliaries of the American Peace Society.

THE CHICAGO PEACE SOCIETY,
175 Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
H. W. Thomas, D. D., President.
Mrs. E. A. W. Hoswell, Secretary.

THE MINNESOTA PEACE SOCIETY,
Minneapolis, Minn.
Dr. James Wallace, President.
Miss A. B. Albertson, Secretary.

THE KANSAS STATE PEACE SOCIETY,
Wichita, Kansas.
George W. Hoss, LL. D., President.
Orman Emery, Secretary.

NEW YORK GERMAN-AMERICAN PEACE SOCIETY.
New York, N. Y.
Dr. Ernst Richard, President,
5 West 63d Street.
Gustav J. Voss, Secretary, 221 East 87th St.
Henry Feldman, Treasurer, 103 Second Ave.

THE ARBITRATION AND PEACE SOCIETY OF CINCINNATI.
First National Bank Building, Cincinnati, Ohio.
William Christie Herron, President,
Lindall R. Meyers, Secretary.

OFFICERS OF THE AMERICAN PEACE SOCIETY.

PRESIDENT :

HON. ROBERT TREAT PAINE, 6 Joy St., Boston, Mass.

CORRESPONDING SECRETARY :

BENJ. F. TRUEBLOOD, LL.D., 31 Beacon St., Boston, Mass.

TREASURER :

THOMAS H. RUSSELL, 27 State St., Boston, Mass.

AUDITOR :

DR. WILLIAM F. JARVIS, 233 Moody St., Waltham, Mass.

VICE-PRESIDENTS :

Rev. Edw. Everett Hale, D.D., 39 Highland St., Roxbury, Mass.
Rev. Lyman Abbott, D.D., Brooklyn, N. Y.
Jane Addams, Hull House, Chicago, Ill.
Rev. Charles G. Ames, D.D., 12 Chestnut St., Boston, Mass.
George T. Angell, 19 Milk Street, Boston, Mass.
Joshua L. Baily, 1624 Arch St., Philadelphia, Pa.
Mrs. Hannah J. Bailey, Winthrop Centre, Me.
Hon. Richard Bartholdt, House of Representatives, Washington.
Rev. Wm. E. Barton, D.D., Oak Park, Ill.
Alice Stone Blackwell, 45 Boutwell St., Dorchester, Mass.
Prof. Geo. N. Boardman, Pittsford, Vt.
Hon. William I. Buchanan, Buffalo, N. Y.
Rev. Everett D. Burr, D.D., Newton Centre, Mass.
Hon. Samuel B. Capen, 38 Greenough Ave., Boston, Mass.
Hon. Jonathan Chace, Providence, R. I.
Rev. Frank G. Clark, Wellesley, Mass.
Edward H. Clement, 22 Southerland Road, Boulevard, Boston.
Rev. Joseph S. Cogswell, Windham, Vt.
Rev. D. S. Coles, Wakefield, Mass.
Geo. Cromwell, Brooklyn, N.Y.
Rev. G. L. Demarest, D.D., Manchester, N. H.
Everett O. Fisk, 4 Ashburton Place, Boston, Mass.
B. O. Flower, Brookline, Mass.
Hon. John B. Foster, Bangor, Me.
Merrill E. Gates, LL.D., Washington, D. C.
Edwin Ginn, 29 Beacon St., Boston, Mass.
Maria Freeman Gray, 3674 22d St., San Francisco, Cal.
Rev. Scott F. Hershey, LL.D., Wooster, Ohio.
Bishop E. E. Hoss, D. D., Citra, Fla.
George W. Hoss, LL. D., Wichita, Kansas.
Julia Ward Howe, 241 Beacon St., Boston, Mass.
Hon. John W. Hoyt, Washington, D. C.
Rev. W. G. Hubbard, Columbus, Ohio.
Rev. Charles E. Jefferson, New York City, N. Y.
Augustine Jones, Newton Highlands, Mass.
Pres. David Starr Jordan, Stanford University, Cal.
Hon. Sumner I. Kimball, Washington, D. C.
Bishop William Lawrence, Cambridge, Mass.
Edwin D. Mead, 20 Beacon St., Boston, Mass.
Rev. Philip S. Moxom, D.D., Springfield, Mass.
George Foster Peabody, 28 Monroe Place, Brooklyn, N. Y.
L. H. Pillsbury, Derry, N. H.
Hon. J. H. Powell, Henderson, Ky.
Hon. Wm. L. Putnam, Portland Me.
Sylvester F. Scovel, D. D., Wooster, Ohio.
Mrs. May Wright Sewall, Indianapolis, Ind.
Mrs. Ruth H. Spray, Salida, Col.
Mrs. L. M. N. Stevens, Portland, Me.
Rev. Edward M. Taylor, D.D., Cambridge, Mass.
Pres. M. Carey Thomas, Bryn Mawr, Pa.
Rev. Reuen Thomas, D.D., Brookline, Mass.
Pres. C. F. Thwing, D.D., Cleveland, Ohio.
Pres. James Wallace, Ph. D., St. Paul, Minn.
Bishop Henry W. Warren, Denver, Col.
Booker T. Washington, LL. D., Tuskegee, Ala.
Kate Gannett Wells, 45 Commonwealth Ave., Boston, Mass
Herbert Welsh, 1305 Arch St., Philadelphia, Pa.
Rev. A. E. Winship, 29 Beacon St., Boston, Mass.
Richard Wood, 1620 Locust St., Philadelphia, Pa.

DIRECTORS :

Hon. Robert Treat Paine, *ex-officio.*
Benjamin F. Trueblood, LL. D., *ex-officio.*
Fannie Fern Andrews, 378 Newbury St., Boston, Mass.
Raymond L. Bridgman, Auburndale, Mass.
Frederick Brooks, 31 Milk St., Boston, Mass.
Rev. S. C. Bushnell, Arlington, Mass.
Frederic Cunningham, 53 State St., Boston, Mass.
Rev. Charles F. Dole, Jamaica Plain, Mass.
Miss Anna B. Eckstein, 30 Newbury Street, Boston, Mass.
Rev. B. F. Leavitt, Belmont, Mass.
Lucia Ames Mead, 20 Beacon St., Boston, Mass.
Wm. A. Mowry, Ph.D., Hyde Park, Mass.
Bliss Perry, 4 Park St., Boston, Mass.
Henry Pickering, 81 Beacon Street, Boston, Mass.
Frederick A. Smith, West Medford, Mass.
Homer B. Sprague, Ph. D., Newton, Mass.
Rev. G. W. Stearns, Jamaica Plain, Mass.
Rev. James L. Tryon, Attleboro, Mass.
Fiske Warren, 8 Mt. Vernon Place, Boston, Mass.
Rev. C. H. Watson, D.D., Arlington, Mass.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE:

Hon. Robert Treat Paine, *ex-officio.*
Benjamin F. Trueblood, LL. D., *ex-officio.*
Frederick Brooks, 31 Milk St., Boston, Mass.
Frederic Cunningham, 53 State St., Boston, Mass.
Wm. A. Mowry, Ph. D., Hyde Park, Mass.
Henry Pickering, 81 Beacon St., Boston, Mass.
Dr. Homer B. Sprague, Newton, Mass.

HONORARY COUNSEL:

Cephas Brainerd, New York, N.Y.
Moorfield Storey, Brookline, Mass.
Judge William L. Putnam, Portland, Me.
Hon. Josiah Quincy, Boston, Mass.

CONSTITUTION
OF THE
AMERICAN PEACE SOCIETY.

ARTICLE I. This Society shall be designated the "AMERICAN PEACE SOCIETY."

ART. II. This Society, being founded on the principle that war is contrary to the spirit of Christianity and of all true religion and morality, shall have for its object to illustrate the inconsistency of war with this spirit, to show its baleful influence on all the great interests of mankind, and to devise means for insuring universal and permanent peace.

ART. III. All persons desirous of promoting peace on earth and goodwill towards men may become members of this society.

ART. IV. Every annual member of the Society shall pay a yearly contribution of two dollars; the payment of twenty-five dollars at one time shall constitute any person a Life member.

ART. V. The chairman of each corresponding committee, the officers and delegates of every auxiliary contributing to the funds of this Society and every minister of the gospel who preaches once a year on the subject of peace, and takes up a collection in behalf of the cause, shall be entitled to the privileges of regular members.

ART. VI. All contributors shall be entitled within the year to one-half the amount of their contributions in the publications of the Society.

ART. VII. The Officers of this Society shall be a President, Vice-Presidents, a Secretary, a Treasurer, an Auditor and a Board of Directors, consisting of not more than twenty members of the Society, including the President, Secretary and Treasurer, who shall be ex-officio members of the Board. All Officers shall hold their offices until their successors are appointed, and the Board of Directors shall have power to fill vacancies in any office of the Society. There shall be an Executive Committee of seven, consisting of the President, Secretary and five Directors to be chosen by the Board, which Committee shall, subject to the Board of Directors, have the entire control of the executive and financial affairs of the Society. Meetings of the Board of Directors or the Executive Committee may be called by the President, the Secretary, or two members of such body. The Society or the Board of Directors may invite persons of well-known legal ability to act as Honorary Counsel.

ART. VIII. The Society shall hold an annual meeting at such time and place as the Board of Directors may appoint, to receive their own and the Treasurer's report, to choose officers, and transact such other business as may come before them.

ART. IX. The object of this Society shall never be changed; but the Constitution may in other respects be altered, on recommendation of the Executive Committee, or of any ten members of the Society, by a vote of three-fourths of the members present at any regular meeting.

Publications of the American Peace Society.

The Teaching of History in the Public Schools with Reference to War and Peace.— Report of a Committee of three appointed by the American Peace Society. Of special interest to teachers. 28 pages. Price 5 cts. each. $3.00 per hundred, prepaid.

Tolstoy's Letter on the Russo-Japanese War.—48 pages and cover. Price, postpaid, 10 cts.

A Regular International Advisory Congress. — By Benjamin F. Trueblood, LL.D. A paper read before the Twenty-first Conference of the International Law Association, Antwerp, Belgium, September 30, 1903. Price 5 cts. each,

War Unnecessary and Unchristian.—By AugustineJones, LL. B. New edition, 20 pages. 5 cts. each, $2.00 per hundred.

The Hague Court in the Pious Fund Arbitration. — Address of Hon. William L. Penfield, at the Mohonk Arbitration Conference, May 28, 1903. Price 5 cts. each.

The Historic Development of the Peace Idea.— By Benjamin F. Trueblood, LL. D. New edition, revised. 24 pages. Price 5 cts. each. $2.50 per hundred.

Passive Resistance — Jesus' Method of Government. — By Algernon S. Crapsey. 12 pages and cover. 5 cts. each; $3.00 per hundred, net.

A Primer of the Peace Movement. — Prepared by Lucia Ames Mead. A reprint of the American Peace Society's Card-display Exhibit at the St. Louis Exposition. A most valuable compendium of statistics, brief arguments, facts, etc. 26 pages, large print. Price 5 cts.; $3 per hundred.

A Solemn Review of the Custom of War. — By Noah Worcester, D. D. A reprint of the pamphlet first published in 1814. 24 pages. Price 5 cts.; $3 per hundred.

Dymond's Essay on War. — With an introduction by John Bright. Sent free on receipt of 5 cts. for postage.

War from the Christian Point of View.— By Ernest Howard Crosby. Revised edition. $1.50 per hundred, prepaid.

Women and War. — By Grace Isabel Colbron. 4 pages. 40 cts. per hundred, postpaid.

A French Plea for Limitation of Armaments. — By Baron d'Estournelles de Constant. Address delivered in the French Senate. 28 pages. Price 5 cts. $3.00 per hundred.

The Absurdities of Militarism.— By Ernest Howard Crosby. 12 pages. Price $1.50 per hundred. Third edition.

An Essay toward the Present and Future Peace of Europe.— By William Penn. First published in 1693. 24 pages, with cover. Price 6 cts., or $3.00 per hundred, prepaid.

International Arbitration at the Opening of the Twentieth Century.—By Benjamin F. Trueblood, LL.D. 20 pages. Price 5 cts. each. $2.50 per hundred, postpaid.

Perpetual Peace. — By Immanuel Kant. Translated by Benjamin F. Trueblood. 53 pages. Price 20 cents, postpaid.

The Arbitrations of the United States. — By Professor John Bassett Moore. 32 pages. 5 cents each. $2.50 per hundred.

The War System: Its History, Tendency, and Character, in the Light of Civilization and Religion. — By Rev. Reuen Thomas, D.D. New edition. Price 10 cts., prepaid.

Report of the Chicago Peace Congress of 1893. — Price postpaid, cloth 75 cts.; paper, 50 cents.

Report of the American Friends' Peace Conference. — Held at Philadelphia in December, 1901. Contains all the papers read. Price 15 cts. postpaid.

The Christian Attitude Toward War in the Light of Recent History.— By Alexander Mackennal, D. D. Address delivered at the International Congregational Council, Boston, September 22, 1899. Price $1.50 per hundred, prepaid.

Military Drill in Schools. — By Rev. W. Evans Darby, LL.D. 8 pages. Price 2 cts., or $1.25 per hundred, postpaid.

William Penn's Holy Experiment in Civil Government. — By Benjamin F. Trueblood, LL.D. 24 pages with cover. 5 cts. each, or $3.00 per hundred, carriage paid.

History of the Seventy-five Years' Work of the American Peace Society. — 16 pages. Two copies for 5 cts.

A Battle, as it appeared to an Eye-witness. — By Rev. R. B. Howard. Letter Leaflet No. 1. 20 cts. per hundred.

The Cherry Festival of Naumburg. — Letter Leaflet No. 4. Price 20 cts. per hundred, prepaid.

Washington's Anti-militarism. — Letter Leaflet No. 6. 8 pages. Price 35 cts. per hundred, prepaid.

Coals of Fire. — By Willis R. Hotchkiss, of the Friends' African Industrial Mission. Letter Leaflet No. 7. Price 30 cts. per hundred, prepaid.

The Christ of the Andes. — 8 pages. Illustrated. $1.00 per hundred, postpaid.

Hard Times.—By Ida Whipple Benham. Letter Leaflet No. 2. Price 20 cts. per hundred, prepaid.

The First Hague Conference and its Results. — 8 pages. 2 cts. each. $1.25 per hundred, postpaid.

Hymns for Peace Meetings. 6 pages. 5 cts. each. 35 cts. per dozen.

The Woman's Journal.

The Woman's Journal, edited weekly at 3 Park Street, Boston, Mass., by Henry B. Blackwell and Alice Stone Blackwell, gives the news of the movement for equal rights for women all over the world. $1.50 per year. Trial subscription, 3 months, 25 cents.

"It is the best source of information concerning what women are doing, what they have done, and what they should do."
—*Julia Ward Howe.*

The Advocate of Peace

A MONTHLY JOURNAL OF THE INTERNATIONAL PEACE MOVEMENT.

Price, One Dollar a Year. In Clubs of ten or more, 50 Cents a Year.

PUBLISHED BY

The American Peace Society,

31 Beacon Street, Boston.

PEACE PUBLICATIONS

FOR SALE BY THE

American Peace Society.

Prices Include Postage.

LAY DOWN YOUR ARMS. By The Baroness von Suttner. Authorized English translation by T. Holmes. New edition, cloth, 65 cts.

SUMNER'S ADDRESSES ON WAR. THE TRUE GRANDEUR OF NATIONS, THE WAR SYSTEM OF THE COMMONWEALTH OF NATIONS, and THE DUEL BETWEEN FRANCE AND GERMANY: The three in one volume. Price, 65 cts., postpaid.

THE PEACE CONFERENCE AT THE HAGUE. By Frederick W. Holls, Secretary of the American Commission to the Hague Conference. 572 pages, octavo. Price, $2.50, postpaid.

CHANNING'S DISCOURSES ON WAR. Containing Dr. Channing's Addresses on War, with extracts from discourses and letters on the subject. Price, 65 cts. postpaid.

ARBITRATION AND THE HAGUE COURT. By Hon. John W. Foster. A concise manual of the chief features of the arbitration movement at the present time. Prepared at the request of the Mohonk Arbitration Conference. Price postpaid, $1.00.

INTERNATIONAL TRIBUNALS: A collection of the Schemes which have been proposed. Adds a long list of instances of international settlements by arbitral courts and commissions. By W. Evans Darby, LL.D. Fourth Edition, much enlarged. Cloth, over 900 pages. Price, $3.50, postpaid.

THE FUTURE OF WAR. By John de Bloch. Preface by W. T. Stead. The sixth volume of Mr. Bloch's great work on "The Future of War," containing all his propositions, summaries of arguments, and conclusions. Price, postpaid, 65 cts.

THE FEDERATION OF THE WORLD. By Benjamin F. Trueblood, LL.D. A discussion of the grounds, both theoretic and historic, for believing in the Realization of the Brotherhood of Humanity, and the final organization of the World into an International State. Second Edition. Cloth, 169 pages. Price, 65 cts.

A LEAGUE OF PEACE. By Andrew Carnegie. The Rectorial Address delivered by Mr. Carnegie to the students of the University of St. Andrews the 17th of October, 1905. 47 pages, paper cover. Price, 10 cts. $5 per hundred.

THE BLOOD OF THE NATION. By David Starr Jordan. Cloth. Price, 40 cts.

TOLSTOY AND HIS MESSAGE. By Ernest Howard Crosby. Cloth. Price, 50 cts.

TOLSTOY AS A SCHOOLMASTER. By Ernest Howard Crosby. Cloth. Price, 50 cts.

WAR INCONSISTENT WITH THE RELIGION OF JESUS CHRIST. By David L. Dodge. A reprint of the first two pamphlets published in this Country in the Interests of Peace. Price, 65 cts.

WORLD ORGANIZATION. By Raymond L. Bridgman. Price, 65 cts.

GARRISON THE NON-RESISTANT. By Ernest H. Crosby. Price, 50 cts.

PATRIOTISM AND INTERNATIONALISM. By Lucia Ames Mead. A Manual for Teachers. Containing Material for Programs for the 18th of May, suggestions as to the teaching of history, etc. Price, 25 cts., postpaid.

Official Report

OF THE

Thirteenth Universal Peace Congress

HELD AT

Boston, October 3-8, 1904

A book of 350 pages, paper covers
Contains all the papers, addresses, and discussions of the Congress
A most valuable document for all peace workers and students of the cause

May be procured at the office of the

American Peace Society
31 Beacon Street, Boston

The only charge is 10 cts., to cover postage and wrapping

60 YEARS' EXPERIENCE

PATENTS

TRADE MARKS
DESIGNS
COPYRIGHTS &C.

Anyone sending a sketch and description may quickly ascertain our opinion free whether an invention is probably patentable. Communications strictly confidential. HANDBOOK on Patents sent free. Oldest agency for securing patents.

Patents taken through Munn & Co. receive *special notice*, without charge, in the

Scientific American.

A handsomely illustrated weekly. Largest circulation of any scientific journal. Terms, $3 a year; four months, $1. Sold by all newsdealers

MUNN & Co. 361 Broadway, **New York**
Branch Office, 625 F St., Washington, D. C.